DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 237 UD 010 162

AUTHOR	Brown, Roscoe C., Jr.
TITLE	District Decentralized Projects: Project No. 3169. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City, 1968-69.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Research Committee.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
REPORT NO	CUE-E-Olle
PUB DATE	Dec 69
NOTE	291p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.25 HC-$14.65
DESCRIPTORS	Community Attitudes, *Cultural Enrichment, *Decentralization, Diagnostic Teaching, Economically Disadvantaged, *Elementary School Students, Federal Programs, Instructional Media, Interviews, Nonprofessional Personnel, Parent Attitudes, Parent Participation, Primary Grades, Questionnaires, Reading Improvement, *Remedial Instruction, Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, New York City

ABSTRACT

This evaluation is focused on the actual operation and results of five decentralized projects. The following criteria were used in the selection of the specific projects examined: the projects would represent different categories of programs, different geographical areas of New York City, and different allocations in amount of the total budget. The general goals of the evaluation were to obtain a detailed description of the project from the Title I and project coordinators, and a measure of pupil performance when pupil performance or behavior was involved, to ascertain the opinions and attitudes of teachers, paraprofessional staff, parents of children involved in the projects, and local community representatives regarding each project. Projects examined were: "Diagnostic and Remedial Learning Laboratory," "Cultural Heritage Implementation Program," "Motivation in Learning," "Parental Involvement in Language Arts and Reading Improvement for Grades 1-3," and "Closed Circuit Television and Video Tape Recording." Findings indicated generally positive results in all projects except the TV Videotape teacher training project, which faltered due to mechanical and administrative problems. Recommendations include those of allotment of more time for planning, creation of another position of Title I coordinator, and more intensive efforts to involve community representatives. Appended are samples of questionnaire and interview forms, materials used, and records of some of the responses. (RJ)

E011e

ED0 40237

Project No. 3169

DISTRICT DECENTRALIZED PROJECTS

by Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.

October 1969

Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1968-69

UD010162

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016

ED0 40237

Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
ESEA Title I Program Evaluation

DISTRICT DECENTRALIZED PROJECTS

UD010162E

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1968-69 school year.

December 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter | Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS i

I DESCRIPTION OF 1968-69 DECENTRALIZED TITLE I PROJECTS 1
- Introduction 1
- Title I Projects 1
- Design for the Evaluation of 1968-69 Title I Projects 6

II DIAGNOSTIC AND REMEDIAL LEARNING LABS FOR GRADES 1 AND 2 OF DISTRICT 16, BROOKLYN 9
- Introduction 9
- Description of the Project 9
- Evaluation of the Project 11
- Recommendations 25

III CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM (CHIP), DISTRICT 4, MANHATTAN 27
- Introduction 27
- Description of the Project 27
- Evaluation of the Project 29
- Recommendations 40

IV MOTIVATION FOR LEARNING PROGRAM, DISTRICT 6, MANHATTAN 41
- Introduction 41
- Description of the Project 41
- Evaluation of the Project 43
- Recommendations 52

V PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN LANGUAGE ARTS AND READING IMPROVEMENT FOR GRADES 1, 2, and 3, DISTRICT 7, BRONX 53
- Introduction 53
- Description of Project 53
- Description of Project Activities 55
- Evaluation of the Project 58
- Recommendations 62

VI CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION AND VIDEO TAPE RECORDING FOR IMPROVING INSTRUCTION, DISTRICT 12, BRONX 64
- Introduction 64
- Description of the Project 64
- Evaluation of the Project 66
- Recommendations 68

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter		Page
VII	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	70
	Projects	70
	Findings	71
	Discussion	72

Appendix A: Tables of Interview Responses
Appendix B: Research Instruments
Appendix C: Materials used in Cultural Heritage Implementation Program
Appendix D: Community Interviews
Appendix E: Staff List

List of Tables

Tables		Page
I-1	Budget Per District - Districts Ranked by Amount Allotted	2
I-2	Number of Projects by District and Type	4
I-3	Per Capita Budget Expenditure by District	5
II-1	Performance on the New York State Reading Readiness Test (At the beginning of the study)	20
II-2	Performance on the Metropolitan Achievement Test Form 2B (At the beginning of the study)	21
II-3	Performance on the Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness Test in March 1969	22
II-4	Performance on the Metropolitan Achievement Test Primary Form 1B	23
II-5	Scores on Frostig Test of Visual Perception	24
III-1	Scores on Test of CHIP and Control Pupils	35
III-2	Average Percent Correct on CHIP Test for CHIP and Control Classes	37
III-3	Attitudes of CHIP Students Toward CHIP	38

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to many people for their efforts and cooperation in the preparation of this study. I would like to express my thanks to: Gloria Mixon for her insightful contributions as consultant on the evaluation, and to James Brooks, Thelma Catalano, Rosalind Ellis, Shirley Hunter, and Richard James who served as interviewers.

Special thanks are due to Mrs. Louise Baggot, assistant project director; Iris Jason, research associate; and Adele Epstein and Patricia Kressel, research assistants, for their coordinated resourcefulness in the execution of this project. I would also like to thank Mr. Joel Harte and Miss Barbara Taub, projects typists, for their excellent work.

My thanks are also extended to the Title I coordinators, the program directors, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents in each of the districts, and the community representatives who so willingly responded to interviews and requests for information.

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF 1968-69 DECENTRALIZED TITLE I PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

In 1968-69 the New York City Board of Education continued its policy of assigning a percentage of its total ESEA Title I funds to decentralized projects. The allotment was made to eligible districts in proportion to the number of children classified as being from poverty families. The decentralized use of Title I funds was initiated on a limited basis in the summer of 1967. In the 1967-68 academic year over 350 separate district projects were funded in this manner; in 1968-69, 265 projects were approved from the districts.

According to guidelines developed by the Board of Education in consultation with the New York City Council Against Poverty, the local district superintendents were required to plan the decentralized educational programs in cooperation with local community representatives. Although it was not necessary for the community representatives to approve the projects, it was hoped that no projects would be submitted that the community representatives did not approve. Most projects did have the approval of the community representatives, but some did not.

TITLE I PROJECTS

In the academic year 1968-69 all of the 29 districts which were classified as having a specified number of disadvantaged children were requested to submit "umbrella" programs in which all of the districts' programs were integrated into one fiscal package. The advantage of this approach was to relate proposed projects to each other more easily. Moreover, economy could be fostered by the joint use of personnel and equipment. The programs, worked out jointly with the community representatives and the school officials, were submitted to the Board of Education for transmittal to the State Department of Education for approval. Approval was given as a matter of course unless there were violations of existing education law.

The total budget of the programs approved and the number of pupils to be served by them is presented in Table I-1. The total budget was $11,119,735 and the total number of pupils to be served was 367,889. The budget ranged from $1,018,734 in District 16, Brooklyn to $41,516 for District 24, Queens. The amount of money allocated to each district was based on the total number of disadvantaged pupils. However, the money did not reflect the number of pupils served by a given project. The number of pupils that the projects were designed to serve is listed

TABLE I-1

BUDGET PER DISTRICT

DISTRICTS RANKED BY AMOUNT ALLOTED*

N = 29

District	Total Amount	No. of Pupils
16	$ 1,018,734	20,183
7	938,178	22,786
19	815,647	78,576
12	753,765	45,883
4	686,368	3,877
17	664,149	2,800
13	635,628	71,884
14	611,314	8,111
6	606,730	6,628
5	601,693	10,878
15	480,927	7,912
8	446,289	6,170
2	327,399	8,220
18	319,843	1,750
1	257,349	1,375
33	251,008	2,420
3	238,565	1,780
30	193,203	2,238
29	185,811	2,550
23	167,476	19,027
28	151,695	2,912
31	142,578	1,420
21	120,905	3,171
32	120,831	2,537
27	109,141	3,379
9	102,361	24,583
10	82,704	1,750
20	47,928	600
24	41,516	2,489
	$11,119,735	367,889

---

*Table indicates the budget allotted per district in relation to projected target pupil population.

in each proposal statement. (For example, in the District 7 Project, the total number of children from low-income families in the district was 442,564; only 22,217 children were to participate in Title I activities.)

The frequency distribution of the 1968-69 decentralized projects classified by type is presented in Table I-2. There were 265 projects included in the umbrella proposals, 85 fewer projects than in 1967-68.

The classification of projects was made by reading each umbrella proposal and examining the program budgets that were submitted to the Budget Office of the Board of Education. Although the proposals were written to present an integrated program, the budgets submitted were itemized for each specific program. These budgets were obtained from the Fiscal Office of the Board of Education. The category with the greatest frequency is the enrichment category, followed by the experimental and teacher training categories. There were fewer reading and language and parent involvement projects in 1968-69 than there were in 1967-68. In the 1967-68 evaluation it was found that the community representatives in many districts urged the school officials to explore more innovative ways of dealing with educational problems in their districts; the increase in the number of the experimental projects is probably a reflection of these requests.

The rank order of the first five projects in order of frequency in 1967-68 and 1968-69 follows:

1967-68	No. of Projects	1968-69	No. of Projects
1. After School Study Centers	66	1. Enrichment	44
2. Reading and Language	45	2. Experimental*	40
3. Parental Involvement	38	3. Community Involvement	32
4. Enrichment	37	4. After School Study Centers	32
5. Experimental*	35	5. Reading and Language	28

An analysis of the per capita budget by category of expenditure is presented in Table I-3. This analysis was possible because the "umbrella" projects like the projects of the previous year included expenditures for professionals, paraprofessionals, supplies and equipment.

---

*Experimental projects include those projects where the focus is on various innovations to improve pupil performance, attitudes, or interest.

TABLE I-2

NUMBER OF PROJECTS BY DISTRICT AND TYPE

District Number	After School Study Center	Parent Involvement	Community Involvement	Homework Helper	Enrichment	Teacher Training	Special Help	Reading And Language	Guidance	Library Aides	Experimental	Administrative	Independent Evaluation	TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS
1				1				1				1		3
2	1				1			1		1	2	1		7
3					1		2				3	1		7
4	2		1		1		1	2		1	1	1		10
5		1	1		1		1		1			1		6
6*	3	1			5		4	2	1	1	2	1		20
7		2	2	1	4		1	1			2			13
8*			3				1	3	1		1			9
9								1			1	1		3
10	8			1			1					1		10
12			3		4	1		4			5	2		19
13			1	1	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	15
14		1	4	1	5				2	1	4	1	1	20
15	2		1	1	4			2			3	1		14
16*		5	3		1	3		2			5	1		20
17			2			1			2			1		6
18	2											1		3
19			3	1	1			1	1	1	4	1		13
20	1							1			1			3
21*	1	1	1	1		1		1						6
23	5		3						2			1		11
24	2	1						1			1			5
27*		1						1				1		3
28	2	1			2		2					1		8
29											2	1		3
30*	1				2				1					4
31[b]*	1	1	2	1	7		1							13
32[b]	1		2		1						2			6
33[b]*					2			3						5
Total 1968-69	32	15	32	9	44	7	16	28	14	6	40	20	2	265
Total 1967-68	66	38	25	24	37	25	16	45	25	14	35	-	-	350

*These are the approximate figures from the Umbrella Proposals.

[b] District 31 is the IS 201 Complex; District 32 is Two Bridges; District 33 is the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Demonstration District.

TABLE I-2

PER CAPITA BUDGET EXPENDITURE BY DISTRICT

District	Amount of Money	Number of Pupils	Prof.	Clerical	Para-prof.	Benefits	Supplies	Equip-ment	Over-head	Other	Total
1	$ 257,349	1,375	$ 55.42	$12.13	$82.44	$19.55	$ 9.60	$1.05	$ 5.89	$ 1.09	$187.16
2	327,399	8,220	18.44	.47	11.43	3.70	.62	.30	.66	4.20	39.83
3	238,565	1,780	25.31	9.10	71.96	21.64	2.17	1.67	1.41	.77	134.03
4	686,368	3,877	95.44	6.44	46.28	19.53	3.30	.97	4.36	.71	177.03
5	601,693	10,878	25.98	1.28	18.34	8.98	.47	.12	.15		55.32
6*	606,730	6,628	53.40	2.77	29.87	2.38	.11	.99	1.66	.37	91.55
7	938,178	22,786	9.83	1.01	22.55	4.86	.87	.01	.57	1.47	41.17
8*	446,289	6,170	UMBRELLA PROPOSAL ONLY								72.32
9	102,361	24,583	2.31	.22	.73	.28	.17	.07	.08	.30	4.16
10	82,704	1,750	41.78	.53	2.43		1.65			.88	47.27
12	753,765	45,883	2.49	.38	9.00	2.36	1.30	.49	.26	.15	16.43
13	635,628	71,884	3.54	.37	2.12	1.17	.17	.08	.11	1.28	8.84
14	611,314	8,111	34.19	1.76	25.17	4.84	2.69	.25	2.34	4.14	75.38
15	480,927	7,912	34.27	1.08	13.41	5.82	1.24	.45	1.91	2.60	60.78
16*	1,018,734	20,183	18.13	3.64	15.87	9.36	1.67	.17	.22	1.41	50.47
17	664,149	2,800	107.07	6.28	81.23	26.18	6.79	.26	1.18	8.22	237.21
18	319,843	1,750	65.77	2.01	77.93	16.40	8.76		11.90		182.77
19	815,647	78,576	2.37	.06	5.10	1.03	.96	.04	.09	.17	10.38
20	47,928	600	56.44	.96	7.23	9.77	4.97	.51			79.88
21*	120,905	3,171	17.71	1.83	12.84	3.10	.77		1.09	.79	38.13
23	167,476	19,027	3.30	.69	3.71	.67	.03	.10	.15	.14	8.81
24	41,516	2,489	13.58	.24	.62	.15	1.61		.49		16.69
27*	109,141	3,379	UMBRELLA PROPOSAL ONLY								32.30
28	151,695	2,912	22.00	.66	8.53	4.25	3.48	1.23	1.90	10.04	52.09
29	185,811	2,550	5.80	3.00	47.46	12.34	2.32	.51	1.11	.32	72.87
30*	193,203	2,238	UMBRELLA PROPOSAL ONLY								86.33
31b*	142,578	1,420	UMBRELLA PROPOSAL ONLY								100.41
32b	120,831	2,537	19.87	1.22	19.50	6.37	.61		.07		47.64
33b*	251,008	2,420	12.71	1.90	54.33	14.23	17.58	1.07	1.90		103.72
Average 1968-69			29.89	2.40	26.80	8.29	2.96	.52	1.72	.21	
Average 1967-68			44.26		27.04		7.87	5.34			

*These figures were taken from the Umbrella Proposal

bDistrict 31 is the IS 201 Complex; District 32 is Two Bridges; District 33 is the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Demonstration District.

The rank order of the per capita expense by the category of expenses in 1967-68 compared to 1968-69 follows:

PER CAPITA EXPENSES

1967-68	Amount	1968-69	Amount
1. Professional	$44.26	1. Professional	$29.89
2. Paraprofessional	27.04	2. Paraprofessional	26.80
3. Supplies	7.87	3. Benefits	8.29
4. Equipment	5.34	4. Supplies	2.96
		5. Equipment	.52

The variation in the per capita expenditures is due principally to the differences in the types of projects that the districts were conducting; e.g., if the district sponsored an after school study center, many teachers were needed and there was a large budget for professional salaries; if the district sponsored a TV teacher training course, a larger budget for equipment was needed; if the district sponsored a teacher aide program (i.e., were providing a paraprofessional for each classroom), a larger budget for paraprofessional salaries was needed.

Some difference in the per capita expenditures may also be due to a more realistic estimate in the 1968-69 project proposals of the number of pupils to be served by each particular project. Other reasons for differences were (1) that the 1968-69 budget reports contained more specifically identifiable categories, and (2) that some of the supplies and equipment that were obtained in 1967-68 may have been used in 1968-69, thus decreasing the expenditure in those categories.

DESIGN FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE 1968-69 DECENTRALIZED TITLE I PROJECTS

It was not possible to study all 265 decentralized Title I projects in 1968-69 in any depth. Instead, it was decided to examine the actual operation and results of five projects in order to learn more about the operation of specific projects in different districts.

While a detailed study of five specific projects does not constitute an evaluation of the other decentralized projects, this approach makes it possible to examine some of the factors that might contribute to the success or failure of projects conducted under a decentralized school administration. It will undoubtedly require examination of many different types of decentralized projects over a period of two or three years in order to obtain a more complete evaluation of the decentralized program.

In making the selection of the specific projects the following criteria were used:

1. The projects would represent different categories of programs (i.e., reading, guidance, etc.).
2. The projects would represent different geographical areas of the city.
3. Wherever possible, the projects would represent different allocations in the amount of the total budget.

The five projects were selected from the seven kinds of programs found most often in the 1967-68 evaluations. (After School Centers were not included because they had originally been planned as a centralized program and were the subject of another independent evaluation.) The sample projects in each category were selected after all the project descriptions were read. The five projects that were selected follows:

Project Type	Project Title	Geographical Area	Proposed Budget
Reading and Language Arts	"Diagnostic and Remedial Learning Laboratory"	Dist. 16, Brooklyn	$79,000
Enrichment	"Cultural Heritage Implementation Program"	Dist. 4, Manhattan	66,803
Experimental	"Motivation for Learning"	Dist. 6, Manhattan	16,594
Parental Involvement	"Parental Involvement in Language Arts and Reading Improvement for Grades 1, 2, 3"	Dist. 7, Bronx	34,700
Teacher Training	"Closed Circuit Television and Video Tape Recording"	Dist. 12, Bronx	15,959

The general goals of the evaluation were as follows:

1. To obtain a detailed description of the project from the Title I coordinator and the project coordinator of each project.

2. To obtain a measure of pupil performance when pupil behavior or performance was involved. Wherever possible, pretest and posttest data were obtained for comparison.

3. To ascertain the opinions and attitudes of the teachers, the paraprofessional staff, and a sample of the parents whose children were involved in each project. This was done through interviews. Where parent interviews were sought, parents were sampled from each of the participating schools.

4. To ascertain the opinions of local community representatives concerning each project and the relationship between the school and the community. This, also, was done through interviews.

A graduate student who was also an experienced teacher with a Master's degree was recruited to function as project evaluator for each of the individual projects.

Each project will be discussed in a separate chapter. Detailed tables of the responses to the questions in the interviews in each project are presented in Appendix A.

CHAPTER II

DIAGNOSTIC AND REMEDIAL LEARNING LABORATORIES FOR GRADES ONE AND TWO OF DISTRICT 16, BROOKLYN

INTRODUCTION

The plan of this chapter will be first to describe the goals of the project, its target population, and the projected duties of the staff. Next, the project as it actually operated will be evaluated. The evaluation was based on interviews with key personnel in the project -- teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents -- and on the results of tests that were given to the pupils by school personnel. Finally, recommendations for improvement of the project will be made. The comments about the quality of some of the activities and procedures in the program were made by a reading specialist from New York University Reading Institute, who was engaged to assist in the evaluation.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The goals of the program as stated in the project proposal were "to diagnose underachievers in reading; to provide a multi-media approach to reading and related language arts skills which provides for careful control over perceptual development through the use of instrument techniques, word attack and comprehension skills developed through audio-instructional and teacher-directed activities, recordings; and to conduct remediation which provides individualization of instruction."[1]

The program was aimed at those children from the first and second grades of seven schools who exhibited serious developmental problems in learning to read. The children were selected for participation in the program on the basis of referrals by teachers and the results of the Frostig Test of Visual Perception. A high correlation was found between the teachers' referrals and those children who did poorly on the Frostig Test. Children who ranked in the lowest percentiles were selected for further diagnosis and clinically planned remediation by the project teachers and the psychiatrist.

The Program

This program was a combination of a remedial reading program which was instituted in January 1968, and a program involving the use of special equipment purchased with Title III funds. The original proposal for the program was for a reading clinic which would provide intensive service to a small number of children. However, the community representatives felt that it was more important to have a program which would provide services to a larger number of children. As a result, this program, which included service for all 420 pupils in the first and second grades and special remedial instruction for a few pupils, was developed as a compromise. The program was budgeted at $79,000.

---

[1] The University of The State of New York, Project Summary Form, District 16, Brooklyn, N.Y., p. 3.

The Educational Developmental Laboratories' Listen, Look, and Learn program was set up in seven schools (P.S. 5, 26, 81, 83, 106, 151 and 274) in November 1968. The instruments used were the Tach-X, the Aud-X, and the Controlled Reader. The Tach-X is a filmstrip projector modified to provide practice in visual discrimination, visual memory, and visual accuracy. The Aud-X is a synchronized filmstrip projector phonograph which introduces visual characteristics and different word meanings in aural context and phonic and structural word analysis principles through directed listening, looking, and writing activities. The Controlled Reader is a modified filmstrip projector which seeks to develop ocular-motility and efficient habits of left to right directional attack.

The Frostig Program for the Development of Visual Perception was used by the project teachers in the individual and small group remediation sessions.

After fifteen to twenty days of work in the program, the Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness Analysis test was administered to all of the children in the program to determine particular areas of weakness in the pupils. When indicated, the project teacher administered further tests to determine auditory, kinesthetic, tactile acuity and laterality, and a general assessment of the pupils was made from the pattern of the pupils' response to various clinical tests, such as the Draw-A-Man test. When parental consent was given, psychiatric evaluations were made. Recommendations concerning the child's learning deficits and abilities were forwarded to teachers and guidance counselors; the parents were also informed of the learning difficulties and other problems which indicated that the parents should seek further help.

The Staff

A project coordinator was employed to administer the program in all the participating schools. Her major responsibilities were to train the classroom teachers, the educational assistants, and the grade coordinators in the use of the EDL program and in the use of the machines and diagnostic techniques; to assist the classroom teachers in administering and checking diagnostic and evaluative tests, and to aid in the diagnosis and planning of remedial and individualized plans. She also was to conduct parent workshops and to plan overall evaluative testing.

Two project teachers were employed to assist the project coordinator; to conduct remediation which could not be performed by the classroom teachers; to interpret clinical diagnosis and remedial plans to classroom teachers, and to assist the classroom teachers with planning for effective use of the laboratory.

A psychiatrist (provided by the Bureau of Child Guidance) was to perform diagnostic work; plan individual remediation with the project coordinator and project teachers, and suggest further referral for medical evaluation and treatment.

A social worker was employed to act as a liaison between the parents, the District Reading Clinic and public agencies; to maintain a list of local agencies which offer assistance to families and individuals; and was to supervise the work of the family assistant.

Two educational assistants were assigned to each of the participating schools. Under the direct supervision of the classroom teachers, they were to take part in the daily and long range planning, to work with small groups or individual children, and to perform related classroom duties as required.

The program plans called for one family assistant who, under the direct supervision of the social worker and the project coordinator, was to assist the social worker in contacting families, public agencies, and schools, and generally to assist children and families who had problems. This person was never hired.

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

The remedial reading program was operational in the following schools; P.S. 5, 26, 81, 106, 151, and 274. The program did not operate in P.S 83 because the teacher of the class which was selected to participate in the program did not desire to use the EDL equipment and procedures.

The plans for the project as outlined in the proposal for this program were carried out with varying degrees of success. The proposed parent workshops, which were to be conducted by the project coordinator, were not given. In fact, the laboratory facility, which was important in the operation of parent workshops and the remedial instruction of the program, was not completed because of administrative problems with the Board of Education.

Project Coordinator

The project coordinator's background is extensive and varied and she was well-qualified for the position. She graduated from Hunter College and has completed sixty graduate credits at the University of the City of New York. Her work experience includes various positions in the day nurseries of the Welfare Department of New York City. She has been a teacher in the public schools for seven years and has been the coordinator of a program for non-English speaking people. She also has been a remedial reading teacher for four years and was a reading consultant in District 16 at the time of her appointment to head the project.

The Teachers Assisting the Project Coordinator

The original plan for this program called for the inclusion of four specially trained teachers to assist the project coordinator and the classroom teacher. Only two people functioned in this capacity, one of whom was brought into the program without special program training when another teacher who had been trained to participate in the project was given another assignment. The shortage of trained personnel to carry out the plans for remediation seriously affected the program because the lack of teachers limited those who received the special instruction.

Training of the Classroom Teachers

The training program on the use of the machines for the classroom teachers, given by the project coordinator, were held as planned. Teachers received one week of special training from 9 A.M. to 12 noon, for this program. When twelve classroom teachers were asked to evaluate the training received by them, the following responses were given:

1. How would you rate the quality of training?

N = 12	No.
Excellent	4
Good	6
Fair	1
Poor	1
	12

2. Why was the training excellent, good, fair or poor?

N = 12

	No.
More specificity needed	2
Practical	5
Clear	4
Good preparation	2
Needs more time	5
	18*

*Multiple responses

3. How would you rate the length of this training period?

N = 12

	No.
Adequate	5
Less than adequate	3
Inadequate	4
	12

In short, most of the teachers felt that the general quality of the training conducted by the project coordinator was good but that the length of the training period was not sufficient to give in-depth training in dividing classes into groups, presenting the lesson, reinforcing skills, and working with slow children. Of thirty-eight responses to a question on specific areas in which additional training should be given, the responses were:

Dividing the class into groups	8
Presenting the lesson	5
Reinforcing the skills	6
Working with slow members of the class	10
Other	9

Relationships between Classroom Teachers and Educational Assistants

The two persons who worked most closely with the students were the educational assistant and the classroom teacher. The classroom teachers were asked to rate their relationship with the educational assistant, and nine said, "excellent," three said, "good," and two thought the relationship to be "poor."

When the fourteen educational assistants were asked about their relationship to the classroom teachers, eleven answered that they worked very closely with the teachers; eight answered that they received directions and instructions from the teachers; and only one indicated that she had very little contact with the teacher.

Performance of Classroom Teachers

The twelve classroom teachers functioned in the program with a fair degree of success. They were generally effective in using the machines. One of the major problems faced by the classroom teachers was teaching the slow learners. When some students failed to progress to the next cycle of instruction, sub-groups were formed. Frequently, three or four students who had either "splintered off" from the main group or who were unable to use the materials in the first place, formed a sub-group of slow learners. The formation of this sub-group increased the number of groups with whom the teacher had to work thus making the teaching situation more difficult.

While some of the problems that the teachers experienced in the program could have been solved by a careful reading of the Teacher's Manuals which accompany the machines and other materials, other problems require a different solution. Problems such as dividing a class into groups, presenting the lesson, reinforcing skills, and working with slow members of the class can only be resolved through extensive training in the special features of this program particularly, and through training in the teaching of reading in general. In fact, special problems encountered when working with the slow learner cannot be resolved through the program itself. Solving the problems of the slow learner requires more expertise in the field of reading than most of the teachers had. Few of the teachers had specific training in reading. Three teachers had taken five or more courses (graduate, undergraduate, and in-service) that dealt specifically with the teaching of reading, one had taken four courses, eight had taken one to three courses, and four had not had any courses that dealt with reading.

Activities of the Neuro-Psychiatrist

The neuro-psychiatrist performed diagnostic work on a small number of referrals and planned, in consultation with the project coordinator and the project teachers, for individual remediation. The lack of a sufficient number of project teachers to make special referrals reduced the number of students to whom the services of the neuro-psychiatrist were available. He did hold periodic meetings with project teachers to discuss ways of working with children who had special problems.

Activities of the Social Worker

One of the major components of this program, designed to address itself to the total experience of the child, was the provision of the services of a social worker. The social worker was to serve as the basic contact between the school and the home, to make referrals to appropriate agencies, establish hospital contact, and conduct discussions in the parent workshops on common problems of parents. Because the position for a social worker in this program was not filled until May, a major component of the program was lost to the majority of the students for the year.

Activities of the Educational Assistants

The description by the fourteen educational assistants of their duties and responsibilities included the following:

N = 14	No.
Work directly with children	13
Assist teacher with records	4
Assist teacher with materials	6
Set up machines and materials	3
Run machines	2
Submit weekly reports	1
Teach lessons	1
	30*

*Multiple responses

An undesirable practice which was widespread, and one which was indirectly indicated by the responses of the educational assistants to the preceding question, was the assigning of educational assistants to some teaching duties. In fact, the response "work directly with children" meant that most frequently their task was to "work" with the slower members of the class. Their tasks ranged from giving remedial instruction in building a sight vocabulary ("See how many of these words the students can recognize by sight, and how many of these pictures he can associate with the correct word") to giving instruction in auditory discrimination ("See in how many words students can hear the short sound of 'i'") and visual discrimination ("Which of these pairs of words are identical? similar? In what way?"). More than any other student, the "slow learner" requires the attention of trained personnel in this phase of his skill development.

On the whole, the attitude of the educational assistants toward the program was favorable. Thirteen liked what they were doing very much, while only one disliked it somewhat and found the job frustrating.

In-Service Training of Personnel

When the evaluation of this program was begun in early March 1969, no in-service training sessions had been held. A report on the need for an in-service training program was submitted by the reading consultant, who was participating in the evaluation, to the director of the Evaluation of the Decentralized Title I Projects, and a conference concerning this matter was arranged with the superintendent of District 16. It was agreed that there was a need to establish an in-service training program.

It was not possible, however, to institute the in-service training program because of the lack of funds.

The only scheduled formal training sessions offered to improve skills directly related to the special features of the program were given by the project coordinator to the classroom teachers only. The teachers received three sessions with the project coordinator instead. Not all teachers were able to attend; five of them reported having received no special training since the program began. Six attended "two or three" meetings. Five of the fourteen educational assistants reported that they had received no special training. Nine reported having received from one to several hours per week. One factor which may account for this discrepancy between the two reports is that each teacher was assigned a special educational assistant (a total number of eight) to work in the new program. In addition, each teacher was assigned a regular teacher aide. The special educational assistants received no additional training, but the regular aides did.

The Diagnostic and Remedial Clinic

Only a small number of students (30) received instruction to remedy the difficulties which were revealed by the diagnostic procedures. There were only two reading clinicians available to conduct these classes. One of the clinicians had not been specially trained to work with perceptual difficulties; she was assigned to the program after one of the trained reading clinicians was removed from the program and given another assignment. The lack of space also limited the amount of remedial instruction that could be given. As previously mentioned, the failure to make available the proposed laboratory facilities adversely affected the program. It is reported that a facility was secured two years ago, but work to make the necessary repairs has never been completed owing to administrative problems with the Board of Education.

Parent and Teacher Opinions about the Program

Although the response of students and parents to a program cannot be the sole indicator of the success or failure, it is significant in a thorough evaluation of a given program. Parents, educational assistants, and classroom teachers seemed to agree that the children in this program liked it and that they were receiving benefit from it.

It was planned to interview one hundred of the parents of the children in the program selected from each of the schools. Despite repeated written and telephone contacts, only fifty-two parents were interviewed. All of the parents interviewed were either black or Puerto Rican.

The fifty-two parents were asked: "How do you think your child feels about these classes?" Forty-five thought that the "kids liked the program very much." When asked if they thought that these classes had helped their child to read better, the fifty-two parents replied:

	No.
Yes, very much	34
No response	18
	52

The fourteen teachers (twelve classroom teachers plus two teachers assisting the project director) in the program were asked to rate the progress of students in the program. Their responses were:

	No.
Excellent	1
Good	6
Fair	2
Poor	0
Not good with slow children	2
Other favorable comments	4
	15*

*Multiple responses

In addition to being asked to rate the progress of students in the program, teachers were asked to compare the progress of students using the "machines" with the progress of students in classes who did not use "machines." They replied:

	No.
Greater progress	6
Less progress	1
About the same	3
Cannot say	4
	14

Another aspect of the program, which may give an indication of student progress, is the assessment of classroom teachers and educational assistants on the effectiveness of the program.

	Classroom Teachers No.	Educational Assistants No.
Very effective	4	8
Effective	7	5
Very ineffective	1	0
Other comments	2	1
	14	14

When they were asked why they thought the program was "very effective" and "effective," eight teachers and six of the assistants said that the program "has meaning for the kids." Twelve teachers felt that the program had "increased the kids' interest in reading," and ten of the assistants felt that the program had "increased interest in school work."

Data on Pupil Performance

Tables II-1 through Tables II-6 present data for eleven classes where it was possible to collect empirical data. Tests were not administered in all classes. Table II-1 shows the pre-program performance of the first grade pupils on the New York State Reading Readiness Test, which was administered in November 1968. Table II-2 shows the data on the Metropolitan Achievement Test for the second grade pupils in November 1968. The second grade pupils who were slow readers were also included in the program. From these data it can be seen that most of the classes selected for the project were toward the lower end of the distribution in their respective schools. P.S. 106 and P.S. 151, however, selected classes that were toward the top of the distribution in those schools, because some teachers of slower classes refused to participate.

Table II-3 shows the mean percentile scores for each of the participating classes on the Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness Test which was given in March 1969. Table II-4 presents the mean percentile scores on Primary Form 1B of the Metropolitan Achievement Test given to the participating classes in May 1969. These data are presented to show pupil progress in reading readiness and reading. While it would have been desirable to use raw scores or grade equivalents so that the data would be more comparable, it was not possible to do so because different tests were given. Thus, it was necessary to average the percentile scores for each test; a procedure which is not usually recommended but was necessary in this case.

The average percentile of the participating classes on the Murphy-Durrell Readiness Test was 63.0 while the average percentile on the Primary 1B Reading Test was 20.8. Although there is a difference in the average percentile on the Murphy-Durrell Readiness Test and the average percentile on the Primary 1B Reading Test, it should be recognized that the readiness percentiles are higher because they are derived from the readiness test which was given in March, after the children already had been in the first grade for five months. These findings suggest that the pupils in the participating groups were still having difficulty in reading at the end of instruction in the program. The average of all classes was the twentieth percentile, which corresponds to a grade equivalent of 1.6. The first and second grade pupils were grouped together for this analysis because they received the same instruction and were at the same level of performance at the beginning of the program.

Table II-5 presents data on the participating groups' performance on the Frostig Test of Visual Perception at the beginning and end of the program. The Frostig Test yields a total perception quotient and a percentile rank score. The percentile scores were used in this analysis. The average percentile for the group was 41.74 for the pretest and 50.22 for the posttest. Five out of eleven comparisons were statistically significant at the five per cent level. These findings suggest that the training was helpful in improving the visual perception of some of the participating groups. The reading performance of these groups, however, did not improve noticeably. Nonetheless, the attitude of the teachers and parents toward the program was positive. The lack of improvement may be due to previously mentioned factors, such as, inadequate training, inadequate time, and variation in the conduct of the program by the teachers.

In summary, the program procedures used to diagnose underachievers were excellent. However, only a limited number of children were diagnosed due to previously mentioned staffing difficulties. Remediation was provided to individualize instruction for thirty students, but again, the lack of staff limited the number of pupils who received help. Although the reading performance of the participating classes did not improve significantly, both the teachers and parents were enthusiastic about the project.

TABLE II-1

PERFORMANCE ON THE NEW YORK STATE READING READINESS TEST (AT THE BEGINNING OF THE STUDY - NOVEMBER 1968)

School	Grade	Number	Rank in School	Mean (Percentile)	Standard Deviation
5	1	28	1	62.4	11.26
5	1	25	2	49.3	12.80
5	1	25	3	47.4	12.76
5	1	30	4	41.5	15.81
5	1	20	5	40.2	10.90
5	1	21	6	39.5	9.79
5	1	21	7	36.0 *	14.96 *
5	1	21	8	33.8	19.41
5	1	9	9	27.3	11.18
5	1	22	10	27.0	12.16
81	1	19	1	64.8	7.74
81	1	28	2	60.2	7.61
81	1	24	3	57.0	8.30
81	1	22	4	56.5	9.69
81	1	21	5	56.1	15.09
81	1	24	6	54.8 *	12.04 *
81	1	25	7	54.3	12.60
81	1	22	8	54.1	13.78
81	1	20	9	49.7	7.68
81	1	13	10	41.7	12.08
106	1	28	1	65.1 *	11.78 *
106	1	20	2	57.1	11.78
106	1	23	3	45.2 *	13.07 *
106	1	14	4	44.9	11.44
106	1	17	5	38.3	14.79
151	1	23	1	55.7 *	11.83 *
151	1	24	2	53.8	11.83
151	1	21	3	48.6 *	10.90 *
151	1	7	4	44.2	8.48
151	1	18	5	42.7	12.72
151	1	22	6	39.1	9.38
151	1	18	7	32.0	8.83
274	1	16	1	68.8	11.66
274	1	14	2	62.0	10.95
274	1	10	3	55.7	9.05
274	1	16	4	49.6	10.63
274	1	17	5	46.7	10.14
274	1	14	6	46.2 *	12.80 *
274	1	15	7	44.1 *	10.63 *
274	1	5	8	43.4	9.27
274	1	4	9	32.0	13.26
274	1	11	10	28.7	11.05
274	1	2	11	24.0	23.89
			Total Mean Percentile	47.01	

* Classes in experimental program

TABLE II-2

PERFORMANCE ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST FORM 2B AT THE BEGINNING OF THE STUDY

School	Grade	Number	Rank	Mean grade equivalent	S.D.
5	2	28	1	3.6	1.15
5	2	29	2	3.0	.62
5	2	30	3	2.76	.47
5	2	26	4	2.3	.48
5	2	28	5	2.1	.85
5	2	25	6	1.9	.07
5	2	26	7	1.8	.17
5	2	23	8	1.6*	.28
26	2	24	1	3.3	.83
26	2	20	2	2.8	.14
26	2	23	3	2.2	.45
26	2	23	4	2.2	.37
26	2	19	5	2.2	.48
26	2	26	6	1.9	.37
26	2	13	7	1.7*	.14
26	2	16	8	1.56	.17
81	2	4	1	4.2	.67
81	2	1	2	4.1	0
81	2	7	3	4.0	.85
81	2	1	4	3.6	0
81	2	23	5	3.5	.57
81	2	24	6	3.2	.50
81	2	29	7	3.0	.55
81	2	23	8	2.7	.45
81	2	26	9	2.6	.30
81	2	24	10	2.3	.89
81	2	26	11	2.1	.63
81	2	15	12	2.0	.48
81	2	21	13	1.77	.30
81	2	20	14	1.8*	.26
		total mean percentile		2.6	

---

* Classes in experimental program

TABLE II-3

PERFORMANCE ON THE MURPHY-DURRELL READING READINESS TEST IN MARCH 1969

School	Grade	Number	Mean Percentile	S.D. of percentile score
5	1	26	53.4	25.15
81	1	27	74.7	22.27
106	1	28	79.7	18.31
106	1	22	36.7	31.66
151	1	30	46.6	21.74
151	1	26	73.8	17.31
274	1	16	62.4	7.66
274	1	21	55.5	33.68
5	2	26	65.2	22.79
26	2	13	73.6	20.42
81	2	22	71.0	17.54
		mean percentile =	63.0	

TABLE II-4

PERFORMANCE ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST PRIMARY FORM 1B*

School	Grade and Class designation	N	Mean Percentile	S.D.
5	1-128	25	11.3	8.24
81	1-6	28	30.0	19.09
106	1-1	28	30.5	23.74
106	1-7	22	22.0	19.34
151	1-104	26	13.7	13.07
151	1-105	28	26.8	17.51
274	1-5	20	13.5	11.41
274	1-6	21	7.8	4.26
5	2-126	27	20.0	15.61
26	2-7	13	26.3	22.72
81	2-6	22	26.6	20.18
	total mean percentile		20.8	
	grade equivalent		1.6	

---

*First and second grade pupils were given the same test. (Pupils in these classes received identical reading instructions since they were reading at the same level.)

TABLE II-5

SCORES ON FROSTIG TEST OF VISUAL PERCEPTION

Schools	N	Grade and Class designation	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	t
P.S. 5	26	1-128	30.5	21.31	26	37.2	26.13	1.67
5	24	2-126	29.9	29.06	24	36.1	28.65	1.17
26	16	2-7	29.8	29.27	16	21.8	23.43	-1.71
81	27	1-6	46	30.61	27	58.7	28.80	2.63**
81	21	2-6	13.9	11.72	21	17.3	10.95	1.21
106	27	1-1	59.4	28.3	27	67.8	22.51	2.12*
106	23	1-7	39.4	25.75	23	58.8	26.03	2.80**
151	26	1-104	58.9	23.18	26	70.9	16.81	2.34*
151	28	1-105	73.3	22.38	28	72.3	22.33	-.38
274	17	1-5	44.6	27.22	17	55.1	26.14	1.96
274	18	1-6	33.4	23.89	18	56.4	22.69	2.65**
		Total Mean	41.74		Total Mean	50.22		

*Significant at 5% level
**Significant at 1% level

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The training and experience of the project coordinator should be utilized more efficiently. Too much of her time is consumed by performing services that should be delegated to other persons.

2. Two "special" assistants to the project staff are needed. One should be trained to instruct the teachers and educational assistants to run the machines and the other given the responsibility of replacing broken machines and making appropriate arrangements for their repair.

3. The initial training period for classroom teachers should be extended in such significant areas as grouping children, introducing the lesson, follow-up activities, and working with individual children or small groups.

4. Appropriate tests of reading readiness and reading should be given at the beginning and end of the school year in order to provide an empirical basis for evaluation.

5. An in-service training program to provide teachers with continuing instruction and assistance throughout their first year in the program should be organized and established. The scheduling of additional training sessions to take place during school hours causes such serious problems as to make the practice undesirable. This type of scheduling presents obstacles for several reasons. First, the absence of the classroom teacher in this program requires substitutes who are specially trained. The lack of such trained personnel and the absence of funds with which to train teachers to take over for regular teachers when they attend training programs during the school day means that these sessions will not be held on a regular basis, if they are held at all. Second, the frequent absence of a teacher from her classroom is disruptive to students, minimizing the effectiveness of the program. These sessions should be scheduled during after-school hours.

6. "Medium slow learners" and "very slow learners" should be assigned to trained personnel and not to the educational assistants. The problems of who is to work with the slow learner and how to work with the slow learner in a classroom are not extremely difficult ones to solve. These problems could be handled in much the same way as they would be handled by any competent teacher. The classroom teacher must give supplementary instruction (frequently remedial in nature) to the "slow" and the "medium slow learners;" the "very slow learner" should receive special instruction in the reading clinic or laboratory. In both cases, the pupils require the services of highly trained personnel, and should not be assigned to the educational assistant.

7. A central facility is needed, which could house a full set of machines for demonstration purposes. A facility of this kind would give teachers a badly needed opportunity to observe classes being conducted in different skill exercises. In addition, this would provide teachers with the opportunity to get together on a regular basis to receive instruction and to share ideas and experiences.

8. Adequate space should be provided for proposed laboratory facilities. Such facilities could permit the physical activities such as stretching exercises and direction walking exercises, as part of the perceptual development program.

9. Perceptual training should be initiated in the pre-school program. The perceptual training which was given in the reading clinic of this program should be started at an earlier age. The pre-school program which was a part of the regular curriculum of most schools involved would be a more profitable stage at which to begin. Under normal conditions, children receive in the home much of the perceptual experience needed to form shape concepts, size concepts, and position concepts which assist them in the early years of their education, especially in reading. Students from this community do not receive enough of such training. Minor adjustments in materials and procedures in the pre-school program would give these students an opportunity to acquire many of these skills before they encounter difficulty in learning to read.

10. The class period should be divided into two parts: part one should be devoted to developing such concepts as space, quantity, and shape relationships. Part two should be devoted to the performance of those physical exercises, suggested by the Frostig Program which can be done in the clinic.

11. Additional materials should be used in perceptual training. Such materials as the large (4 or 8 inches in length $\frac{1}{2}$ inch thick) kinesthetic alphabets, geometric shapes, numerals, and jumbo interlocking blocks will give students practice in fixing ideas of quantity, space, and shape relationships.

12. Experiences which will improve conversation, such as learning to interview, dramatizing stories, telling about out-of-school activities, and participating in dramatic plays should be used by teachers in the program.

CHAPTER III

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM (CHIP), DISTRICT 4, MANHATTAN

INTRODUCTION

The plan of this chapter will be first to describe the goals of the project, its target population, and the projected duties of the staff. Second, the project as it actually operated will be evaluated. The evaluation was based on interviews with key personnel in the project, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents. Third, results of tests given to the pupils by the evaluation staff will be described. Finally, recommendations for improvement of the project will be presented. The comments about the quality of some of the activities and procedures in the program were derived from interviews with the project director and informal observations made by the project evaluator.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Cultural Heritage Implementation Program was a recycling of a program funded under Title I during the school year 1967-68. The program was funded at $66,057 for the school year 1968-69 to include 1,200 pupils from five elementary schools.

The goals as stated in the project proposal were: "to create pride and awareness of the diversity of the multi-racial character of the environment; to orient the children to their cultural heritage and that of their neighbors; to develop conceptual learning and acceptance of reading; to familiarize professionals and paraprofessionals with the educational climate; and to involve the parents in culturally oriented activities."[1]

The Program

The projected target pupil population in the original proposal was 1,200 pupils, but only twenty-three classes (approximately 750 pupils) actually participated because some teachers did not wish to involve their classes in the program.

The program was conducted in Public Schools 57, 80, 154, 155, 161, and one parochial school, Commander Shea.(Commander Shea was not included in the original proposal because it was in the public school area, but the program director felt that its participation would be worthwhile.) The program operated daily from 9:00 to 3:00 beginning September 3, 1968 and ending June 30, 1969.

---

[1] The University of The State Of New York, Project Summary Form, District 4, Manhattan, N.Y. p. 4.

The schools themselves selected the classes to be part of the CHIP program using a variety of criteria, among which were interest of teacher, schedule, and interest of children. Twenty-three classes of the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades, including three from Commander Shea School, were selected either by the principals or by the teachers. The participating classes included the following:

Third grade - one class
Fourth grade - nine classes
Fifth grade - seven classes
Sixth grade - six classes

The program was presented in three phases: 1) a representative of one of the three cultures - Afro-American, African, and Antillean - was introduced in a dramatic presentation; 2) background information about each culture was made available before and after the performance to develop further the awareness of the pupils, and 3) the person representing each culture returned to the school and again performed in an environment that permitted instruction on a more informal basis.

Workshops were held after each dramatic presentation. Classroom teachers, CHIP teachers, and paraprofessionals attended to discuss ways in which the interest of the children could be sustained and generalized to other subject areas.

Dramatic performances, library books, and ethnic music relevant to the child's immediate environment were incorporated into a curriculum which included African culture, Afro-American heritage and Antillean culture. These were supported from other funds received by the district. The historical development, poetry, art, literature, and customs of the different areas were discussed in class sessions. Guests from Nigeria, Haiti, and Ghana were featured in theatrical presentations. Examples of unit outlines are presented in Appendix C. Parents of pupils in the Cultural Heritage Implementation Program accompanied groups on trips and participated in costume designing and other related activities.

The Staff

A program director was employed three days a week to administer the program. His major responsibilities were to select and guide the CHIP personnel, to edit material for school distribution, to consult with principals on teacher selection, to plan schedules, and to act as a liaison with state, city, and federal agencies and foundations. Other duties of the director were to order supplies and textbooks, to direct bi-monthly training workshops, to handle publicity and public relations, to direct and schedule use of consultants, and to hold weekly staff meetings.

The program also employed three full-time teachers, one for each of the relevant cultural areas. Their primary responsibilities were to develop sequential lesson plans as suggested in CHIP guidelines, charts, and illustrations, and to teach the CHIP curriculum in the participating schools. Some of their other duties were to arrange for and use multi-media, to develop experiences and concepts, to arrange for school bi-monthly planning cooperative conferences with classroom teachers, to assist at the bi-monthly after-school workshops, and weekly staff meetings, and to assist at the annual CHIP festival.

Two teacher aides were assigned to each of the five participating public schools; none were assigned to the parochial school. Their duties were to distribute and mimeograph materials submitted by the director, to distribute books, supplies, and instruments, to assist CHIP teachers at demonstrations and trips, and to take part in the bi-monthly after-school workshop with CHIP teachers.

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

The data for evaluation of the program were collected by interviewing randomly selected parents whose children were in CHIP, CHIP teachers, and classroom teachers, and by testing experimental and control groups of children. The description of the ethnic background and sex distributions of the groups that were interviewed are listed below:

A) Parents whose children were in CHIP (N = 48)

	No.		No.
Black	36	female	48
Puerto Rican	12	male	0

B) CHIP Teachers (N = 3)

Black	2	male	1
White	1	female	2

C) Classroom Teachers (N = 23)
(includes parochial school teachers)

Black	7	male	3
White	15	female	20
Puerto Rican	1		

D) Teacher Aides (N = 10)

	No.
Black	6
Spanish speaking or Puerto Rican	4

The tables presenting the detailed data on which this section is based are presented in Appendix B.

Responses of Classroom Teachers Participating in CHIP Program

Twenty of the teachers interviewed were female, all were over 21 years of age; fourteen possessed regular licenses and fifteen had been teaching for from one to ten years. Of the eighteen classroom teachers interviewed in CHIP, thirteen were participating for the first time; the remaining five had been in the program in 1967-68 and when asked if the program had changed from 1967-68, stated that it had.

Three of the teachers rated CHIP as an "excellent" program and eight rated CHIP a "good" program because the children were enthusiastic and enjoyed the program. The teachers who indicated that they rated the program as "fair" cited poor organization as the main reason for their opinion.

The children who participated in CHIP were especially enthusiastic about the theatrical presentations. Nine teachers said that this enthusiasm was carried over into the CHIP class sessions only at times. Eleven teachers were able to incorporate material presented in the CHIP classes into their regular classes through techniques such as class discussions (thirteen), debates (eight), and compositions (seven). Two teachers said they were not able to incorporate material presented in the CHIP classes into their regular class curriculum.

Fifteen teachers had had no orientation prior to participation in CHIP, and fourteen did not attend planning sessions during the operation of the program.

Eight responding teachers indicated that the paraprofessionals were to work directly with the children; five indicated that the paraprofessionals were to assist teachers with the collection of material and lesson planning, and one indicated that the paraprofessionals were to assist teachers with the paper work. Five teachers did not know to whom the paraprofessionals were responsible, though four teachers responded that paraprofessionals were responsible to the CHIP teacher.

The classroom teacher's relationship to the CHIP teacher ranged from "very little contact" (six), to "received material and suggestions from him" (ten), to "worked very closely with him" (two).

Two classroom teachers rated the program director as "very effective" and nine rated him as being "effective." His interest in the students and his ideas were given as the reasons for his effectiveness. One teacher rated him "very ineffective" because of poor coordination and lack of communication. Four teachers declined to rate the program director because they did not know him well enough.

When teachers were asked how their classes were selected to participate in CHIP, thirteen responded that the principal chose the classes; three indicated that the classes were chosen by lot, and two volunteered their classes.

The most frequent teacher suggestions to improve the program were: having better organization (twelve), having more planning sessions (nine), obtaining more and better material (nine), and developing better curriculum (eight). Twelve thought that an expert in the field should qualify as a CHIP teacher even though he may not have a teacher's license. Five said that a dynamic teacher who is capable of relating to the students would also be a good CHIP teacher. Others stated that a CHIP teacher should be black (seven), or Spanish-speaking (four).

Sixteen teachers stated that they would like their classes to participate in CHIP next year because the "teacher learns as the student learns." Two said that they would not like to have their classes participate because of poor coordination and poor organization. In summary, most teachers considered the content of the program to be good, but felt that the program's organization needed strengthening.

Responses of the Teachers Who Presented CHIP Lessons

There were three CHIP teachers, one black man and two women, one black and one white. Two of the teachers hold regular licenses and one has a substitute license. The number of years of teaching experience ranges from one year to fifteen years.

All three teachers who presented the CHIP lessons were new to the program. They rated CHIP overall as being excellent because the children gained factual knowledge and were more stimulated to learn.

They agreed with the classroom teachers that the children's reaction to the theatrical presentations was enthusiastic. Two of the three teachers thought that this enthusiasm carried over into CHIP class sessions and thought the children were more responsive. The third CHIP teacher thought that this enthusiasm carried over only sometimes and that the children's reaction to CHIP classes as compared to regular academic classes was "about the same."

All three teachers had curriculum plans which the program director or the teacher himself had developed. Books, objects from the child's environment, special commercially developed material, and personally created material were incorporated into the curriculum.

Each teacher had orientation or planning sessions ranging from one day to more than one week. The program director conducted these planning sessions and continued to do so during the operation of the program.

Each CHIP teacher was assigned a paraprofessional whose duties included working with the children and assisting the teacher in collecting material and planning class meetings. In discussing their relationship to the classroom teachers, CHIP teachers stated that they worked closely with the teachers and gave materials and suggestions to them.

They described their relationship to the program director as close and rated him as being effective because he accomplished the aims of the program and was creative in his conceptualization of it.

Suggestions to improve the program included expansion, hiring more experienced teachers, having more planning sessions, and hiring more paraprofessionals.

Responses of Teacher Aides

Of ten teacher aides, seven were new, not only to the CHIP program, but also to the job of being a teacher aide. Because of personnel changeover in the program and the teachers' strike, proper orientation was not possible. There was a great deal of confusion as to what their job was and to whom they were responsible. This confusion was increased by the structure of the program. The teacher aides were hired by the schools from their respective neighborhoods. The aides were responsible to their school for time cards and part of their work load, whereas their salary and the remainder of their work came from CHIP.

On the whole the teacher aides enjoyed their work, which consisted of working directly with the children and assisting the teachers. All felt they were needed and all but one felt it was more than just a job, mostly because they liked to work with children. Eight of the aides rated the program director as being very effective because he worked well with children and teachers; they felt they worked closely with both classroom and CHIP teachers. Most had a positive attitude toward their school. Six said their attitudes had changed toward their school -- three of these six indicated that their attitude became more favorable; four of the six acquired more understanding of the problems faced by the school; and two of the six said they had more understanding of the lack of relevance of the present educational matter for children.

Six of the aides rated the overall program excellent; three rated it good; and one rated it not needed. Eight felt that the program had real meaning for the children; five said it stimulated the children's interest in reading and other school work. Six felt the program could be improved by more training for teachers and paraprofessionals; seven felt there was a need for more teacher aides. Six said that CHIP teachers should be experts in the field, not necessarily experienced licensed teachers. Eight would like to be teacher aides next year because the duties were rewarding.

Parents' Opinions of the Program (N = 48)

Out of forty-eight parents interviewed, forty-five felt it was important to teach African culture in the schools. The three negative reactions were all from parents in P.S. 161. Thirteen felt that CHIP was necessary to present an accurate historical picture, thirteen specifically mentioned the necessity for learning about the black race, while fourteen wanted their children to learn about their ancestors' contributions. The same people did not respond positively to the same questions. In P.S. 154, for instance, one parent felt the need for learning about all people, while five of the parents said it was important to learn about the black race. Two of the parents at P.S. 154 thought that pride was significantly important while the total of all five schools on this question was only three parents.

All ten of the parents interviewed from P.S. 57 and 154 knew that their children were enrolled in CHIP, yet twenty-two of the thirty-eight parents in P.S. 80, 161, and 155 did not know that their children attended cultural heritage classes. Even though twenty-two of the parents of these three schools knew nothing of the cultural heritage classes, they all said that their children discussed "what they do" at school. Four of the parents indicated that their children had specifically mentioned the trips that they had taken.

Nineteen parents stated that this was the first year that their children had participated in CHIP (one parent from P.S. 155 did not know). Twenty-one of the parents said their children told them about CHIP classes; thirteen of the twenty-one were told about "things the child learned." Thirteen of the parents said their children liked the classes very much, six thought their children liked them better than other classes, and significantly, no children told their parents that they disliked CHIP classes. Seventeen of the children brought home something from these classes. Twenty-three of the parents knew of the cultural heritage theatrical presentations their children attended. Only three parents have been asked to help in any way with the classes, and two were asked to go on trips with the class; being asked to go on trips with a class is not unusual in elementary grades, in or out of a special program.

Only two parents, from P.S. 161, knew the CHIP director and both rated him very effective. When asked for suggestions as to how to improve the program, seven thought it "okay as is" and fourteen did not know, with no other category having any significant percentage of positive responses. No one suggested a need for better organization in the program.

Most of those who responded felt that a cultural heritage program is important in the elementary schools for the children. The children seemed to have overwhelmingly enjoyed the CHIP classes, much more so than the regular classes -- though a class that meets once a week may be more appreciated simply because it is a diversion from routine schoolwork.

Data on Pupil Performance

In order to obtain data on what CHIP classes knew about black and Antillean history when compared to similar non-CHIP classes, a fifteen-item test was prepared by the evaluation staff and administered to the CHIP and control classes. Five other questions were included to obtain the pupils' opinions about the program.

Tables III-1, III-2, and III-3 present data on the performance of CHIP classes and control groups of selected classes from the same schools on a test of knowledge of various ideas in black and Antillean history. An effort was made to select comparison classes with similar reading scores. But since the reading test was administered at the end of the program, it was not possible to pre-select the classes so that there would be a close match. The control group's reading scores were higher in some schools because CHIP was assigned to the classes with lower reading scores in those schools.

Table III-1 shows that seven out of twenty-three comparisons between CHIP and control groups were significant at the five percent level in favor of the CHIP classes. One comparison was significant in favor of the control class. Of all twenty-three comparisons fifteen were in favor of the CHIP classes. P.S. 161 was the most successful school with four out of six comparisons significant in favor of the CHIP classes.

Table III-2 shows the average percentage of items correct in the test for experimental (CHIP) and control (non-CHIP) groups. The average number correct is 50.6 percent for the CHIP classes compared to 44.0 percent for the control groups. While the difference of six percent more questions correct is not extremely significant, it does show that some difference exists between classes that have been exposed to CHIP and those that have not.

Table III-3 presents data on opinions of the pupils about CHIP and their awareness of the countries studied in CHIP. According to these data the pupils liked the CHIP program and were aware of what the CHIP program was trying to do.

TABLE III-1

SCORES ON TEST OF CHIP AND CONTROL PUPILS

CHIP classes					Control classes						
Class Desig.	N	Reading Score	Mean	S.D.	Class Desig.	N	Reading Score	Mean	S.D.	t	d.f.
					P.S. 57						
3-1	24	5.18	7.1	1.86	3-2	26	3.60	6.0	2.54	1.16	48
4-6	19	2.56	7.1	1.92	4-3	29	3.74	7.4	1.84	-.34	46
4-5	23	2.93	5.8	2.15	4-4	26	3.23	6.0	2.49	-.20	47
					P.S. 80						
6-6	23	4.50	6.8	2.58	6-4	21	3.90	7.1	1.94	-.30	42
5-4	15	3.56	4.9	1.53	5-5	19	3.67	6.1	2.50	-1.20	32
4-2	22	4.10	7.5	2.06	4-1	20	3.15	5.5	2.14	2.06	40
					P.S. 154						
4-310	14	4.54	5.1	2.01	4-302	19	4.21	6.2	1.86	-1.10	31
4-303	9	3.71	3.8	2.06	4-307	14	3.86	5.1	2.93	-1.06	21
5-412	19	4.84	7.8	2.03	5-406	10	6.28	6.9	1.92	.86	27
5-404	17	4.98	7.8	2.01	5-405	20	6.36	5.4	1.73	2.53	35
6-212	13	6.26	9.1	1.13	6-213	22	6.48	8.0	1.83	1.26	33
					P.S. 155						
6-10	26	9.9	9.3	2.33	6-4	28	5.1	7.6	1.67	1.91	52
5-2	27	5.4	7.8	1.78	5-4	22	4.2	6.8	1.98	1.14	47
4-10	15	5.2	8.8	2.59	4-2	20	3.8	5.2	2.69	3.16	33

TABLE III-1
(continued)

CHIP Classes					Control Classes						
Class Desig.	N	Reading Score	Mean	S.D.	Class Desig.	N	Reading Score	Mean	S.D.	t	d.f.
					P.S. 161						
6-243	28	7.0	8.6	2.47	6-241	24	6.0	6.6	1.77	2.17*	50
6-201	27	5.0	8.6	1.22	6-245	21	4.6	6.5	2.04	2.50*	46
5-209	28	6.9	8.6	1.99	5-208	24	4.9	7.0	1.95	1.80	50
5-207	29	3.5	5.2	2.11	5-206	24	3.7	7.1	1.66	-2.18*	51
4-118	19	6.8	8.5	1.66	4-M39	23	3.8	5.5	2.18	3.26**	40
4-217	21	4.7	7.5	1.70	4-M35	22	3.5	4.6	1.30	3.58**	41
					Commander Shea						
6-B	40		6.2	1.83	6-A	32		6.1	3.42	.11	70
5-B	33		4.5	2.08	5-A	33		6.0	1.85	-1.79	64
4-A	38		6.2	2.17	4-B	35		5.2	1.95	1.20	71

* significant at the 5% level
** significant at the 1% level

TABLE III-2

AVERAGE PERCENT CORRECT ON CHIP TEST FOR CHIP AND CONTROL CLASSES

School	Grade	CHIP classes		Control classes	
		N	Mean %	N	Mean %
57	3	24	50.6	26	42.9
57	4	23	41.5	26	43.1
57	4	19	50.3	29	52.7
80	5	15	35.2	19	43.6
154	4	9	26.9	14	36.9
154	4	14	36.2	19	32.2
154	5	19	67.8	10	49.3
154	5	17	55.9	20	38.9
154	6	13	66.7	22	56.8
155	4	15	62.9	20	37.1
155	5	27	55.6	22	48.3
155	6	26	66.1	28	59.4
161	4	19	60.5	23	39.4
161	4	21	53.7	22	33.1
161	5	28	61.7	24	50.2
161	5	24	27.0	29	36.9
161	6	28	61.7	24	47.5
161	6	27	61.1	21	46.5
CSS	4	38	44.7	35	37.3
CSS	5	33	32.2	33	42.6
CSS	6	40	44.2	32	47.3
80	4	22	51.9	20	38.9
80	4	23	48.8	21	51.8
	Mean Average		50.57		44.03

TABLE III-3

ATTITUDES OF CHIP STUDENTS TOWARD CHIP

WHAT IS CHIP? *

	Art and Music	Place	Cultural Heritage	Other	Love
P.S. 57 all grades	4	12	50	2	0
P.S. 80 all grades	10	4	46	1	0
P.S. 154 all grades	9	5	44	1	0
P.S. 155 all grades	6	10	32	0	0
P.S. 161 all grades	13	3	126	6	5
Commander Shea all grades	10	17	51	3	0
Total	52	51	349	13	5
Per cent	11.4	11.1	76.2	2.1	1.1

DO YOU LIKE CHIP?

	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response
P.S.57 all grades	59	0	7	0
P.S. 80 all grades	57	1	2	0
P.S. 154 all grades	51	4	4	0
P.S. 155 all grades	29	4	15	0
P.S. 161 all grades	133	1	17	1
Commander Shea all grades	57	5	10	1
Total	386	15	55	2
Per cent	84.3	3.3	12.0	0.4

* multiple response

TABLE III-3
(continued)

HAVE YOU LEARNED NEW THINGS IN CHIP?

	Yes	No	Don't Know	No Response
P.S. 57 all grades	59	0	7	0
P.S. 80 all grades	54	1	5	0
P.S. 154 all grades	53	1	4	1
P.S. 155 all grades	31	3	13	1
P.S. 161 all grades	142	2	6	2
Commander Shea all grades	63	2	8	0
Total	402	9	43	4
Percentage	87.8	2.0	9.4	0.8

WHAT THREE PLACES HAVE YOU LEARNED ABOUT IN CHIP? *

	Japan	Africa	Russia	U.S.	France	Caribbean	Other
P.S. 57 all grades	0	63	6	27	7	42	2
P.S. 80 all grades	7	58	6	34	7	44	1
P.S. 154 all grades	7	56	1	14	1	20	1
P.S. 155 all grades	4	43	1	20	9	31	0
P.S. 161 all grades	6	148	12	78	22	108	4
Commander Shea all grades	3	66	5	42	7	24	0
Total	27	434	31	215	53	269	8
Percentage	5.9	94.8	6.8	46.9	11.6	58.7	1.7

* multiple response

In summary, the data suggest that the program was generally successful in stimulating pupil enthusiasm. Although a test comparing relevant knowledge of those who participated in CHIP classes with those who did not shows less gain in knowledge than might have been anticipated, the children felt that they learned a good deal from the program. However, no evidence is available to indicate whether or not the program made any contribution in reaching the goal "to develop conceptual learning and acceptance of reading." Answers to the questionnaire indicate that parents knew that their children participated in CHIP, but parents actually participated in culturally oriented activities in only two of the five schools investigated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The director should have a more important role in selecting the classes to be assigned to the program. The principals and teachers selected the classes without consultation with the project director. It is important that all persons involved in operating the program should have more of a role.

2. More paraprofessionals should be assigned to the project. There are many opportunities in the project for paraprofessionals to assist in carrying out the various activities in the project.

3. More attempts should be made to involve the parents of children in the CHIP program in program activities. Although some parents did participate in the program as guides on trips, few of parents were aware of the various activities in the project or participated in project activities.

4. Efforts should be intensified to improve the organization of the project. Although opinions about the project were generally favorable, the main complaint from those who were involved in the program was a lack of organization and a lack of communication among project personnel. Both planning and communication suffered from the teacher strike and a change in CHIP personnel at the beginning of the school term. In addition, most of the teachers did not attend any planning sessions which were scheduled for them during the previous semester. They were not required to do so and as a result most did not attend.

CHAPTER IV

MOTIVATION FOR LEARNING PROGRAM, DISTRICT 6, MANHATTAN

INTRODUCTION

The plan of this chapter will be first to describe the goals of the project, the target population for the project, and the projected duties of the staff. Second, the project as it actually operated will be evaluated. The evaluation was based on interviews with key personnel in the project, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents, and on observations of tutorial sessions. Third, results of pupil ratings made by the classroom teachers will be described. Interview schedules were developed for participating classroom teachers, educational assistants, family assistants, and parents of the children in the program. A scale on which classroom teachers could rate the children in the program was also developed. Finally, recommendations for improvement of the project will be presented. The comments about the quality of some of the activities and procedures in the program were derived from interviews with the project director and informal observations made by the project evaluator.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Motivation for Learning program was proposed by the supervisor of guidance for District 6 as a Title I program for the academic year, 1967-68. The original proposal was an extensive guidance project and was to be implemented in six schools. It was considered and rejected by the community corporations in the district and by the district superintendent's staff. The expressed reasons for the rejection were that it would cost too much and that other programs were needed more by the community.

However, the supervisor of guidance was convinced of the necessity for such a program in the district, and persisted in her attempts to have it accepted as a Title I program for 1968-69. Therefore, she consulted with the Title I Coordinator and the educational directors of the Central Harlem Community Corporation and the Upper West Side Community Agency. Both educational directors were receptive to the idea of the program and the Title I Coordinator suggested that the supervisor of guidance resubmit her proposal in an abbreviated form for 1968-69. This was done and the proposal for the present program was approved for implementation in three schools, P.S. 92, 175, and 186. The program was budgeted for $16,594.

The goals as stated in the project proposal were: 1) "To prevent educational retardation and consequent maladjustment, the effects of which become cumulative as the child progresses through the grades; 2) to help children see themselves as part of the occupational and cultural mainstream of life and thus stimulate them to intrinsic motivation toward mastering the academic skills necessary to attain this goal; 3) to develop new approaches to parent participation in school-home-community activities to raise educational and occupational goals; 4) to create a supportive functioning team relationship among professionals, auxiliary personnel, and parents wherein there will be a maximum utilization of the skills of each in promoting children's learning; 5) to help teachers identify ability and develop techniques effective in increasing realization of potential."[1]

The program's target population was any children in the participating schools who had specific learning problems, and their parents. Children needing motivation for learning were defined as the underachievers, the "disruptive," and the potentially maladjusted. The major emphasis of the program was on the early grades, but did not exclude children in the upper grades who fell under the definition of children needing motivation for learning.

One guidance counselor was employed to institute and direct the program in all three schools. Her major responsibilities were to identify the children who needed special help, to determine the kind of service needed by them, and to provide individual or small group counseling for them before possible referral for more intensive help. She was also to plan and direct the activities of the educational (guidance) and family assistants, to prepare materials and resources for the classroom teachers to use in lessons and related trips, to plan and conduct parent workshops, to prepare newsletters for parents, and, when necessary, to confer individually with parents.

Each school had one educational (guidance) assistant who, under the direction of the guidance counselor or a teacher, was to provide individualized assistance to individual or small groups of children. In addition, the educational assistant was to help the guidance counselor prepare materials and resources for use in the program and to help prepare the newsletter to the parents. Finally, the educational assistant was to accompany teachers on trips that included children of the program.

Each school also had one family assistant who, when it was necessary to enlist cooperation, was to visit parents of the children in the program at home. The family assistant also was to aid the parents in obtaining help for themselves and/or their children, and was to care for younger siblings in a central facility so that parents could attend parent meetings. Further responsibilities of the family assistant were to help the guidance counselor compile a list of community resources and interpret their use to the parents, and to assist the guidance counselor in the arrangements for parent workshops.

---

[1] The University of The State of New York, Project Summary Form, District 6, Manhattan, N.Y., p. 4.

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

All comments about and recommendations for this program must be prefaced by the statement that the program started very late and, therefore, was not in operation long enough to prove or disprove its ability to fulfill its stated objectives. This general conclusion, based upon observations of the investigators, is substantiated by the fact that nine of the twenty-three participating classroom teachers said that the program was too new for them to evaluate and that the children did not participate long enough for them to discern any resultant behavioral or academic change in the children.

The Program

There were several reasons for the late beginning of the program. First, the program was funded for only seven months which made its scheduled starting date December 1, 1968. Second, the program was further delayed by the teachers' strike and the blizzard. Third, the guidance counselor who was hired to implement the program could not be released from a prior commitment until February 10, 1969. Fourth, one school, P.S. 175, in which the program was implemented, had a full-time guidance counselor on its staff. Considerable time was spent in defining and limiting the areas of responsibility of the staff counselor and the Motivation for Learning counselor. The progress of the program at P.S. 175 was further impeded by the general disruption to the school schedule caused by resistance to the change of the Easter recess. Fifth, another school, P.S. 186, in which the program was to operate, was unable to provide physical space for the program and, after prolonged negotiations, was excluded from the program. An alternate school, P.S. 28, was chosen the latter part of March 1969.

Since the third school, P.S. 28, was selected to participate in the program at a later date, its personnel and implementation of the program differed significantly from P.S. 92 and P.S. 175. Therefore, a discussion of the program as it operated in P.S. 28 will be presented at a later point in this report. The following comments are applicable to the program as it operated in P.S. 92 and P.S. 175.

The guidelines for the program as stated by the proposal are ambitious in their goals and vague or non-existent in methodology. The translation of the proposal's guidelines into operational terms required careful planning in several areas. One area of major importance was the selection of the target population, i.e., children needing motivation for learning. The criteria necessary to define such children, and the development of instruments and techniques to identify them are demanding tasks which should be performed in the planning stage of the program. Since no time was allocated for planning, the guidance counselor had to perform these functions after the scheduled starting date of the program. The start of the actual program was therefore further delayed.

P.S. 92 was the first school in which the program became operative. In order to identify the population, the guidance counselor developed a screening checklist which she distributed to the classroom teachers of grades 1 through 3. Each teacher was asked to select those children in his or her class who presented learning difficulties, and to complete a screening checklist for each child who was chosen. The teachers experienced some difficulty in using the rating scale because they had no experience in ranking with such scales and the guidance counselor met with teachers individually to help them complete the scales.

P.S. 175 got off to a slow start. However, by the latter part of March, rating scales were distributed to the teachers of classes, grades 1 through 3. Again, the teachers experienced some difficulty in completing the rating scales with the appropriate and accurate information, and the guidance counselor met with those who needed assistance. The final program population was made up of:

P.S. 92

1st graders - 7
2nd graders - 10
3rd graders - 15
5th graders - 2
Total 34

P.S. 175

1st graders - 9
3rd graders - 10
Total 19

Twenty percent of the program population at P.S. 92 were of Spanish-speaking origin and eighty percent were black. At P.S. 175, one hundred percent were black.

Continuity is important for the success of most educational programs. Continuity is lacking in the Motivation for Learning program because the counselor's time is divided between two schools; she is in one school two days a week and in the other school three days a week. This division of the counselor's working schedule limits the amount of time that she may spend with the teachers of each school and thus prevents a close team relationship with the teachers. It also presents difficulty in scheduling appointments. For example, if a teacher needed to confer with the guidance counselor concerning a student in the program, he might have to wait from two to five days before the counselor was available in his school again.

Furthermore, the division of the guidance counselor's time decreased the possibility of personal contact with the parents of the children in the program. As an illustration of this point, consider a case in which the guidance counselor has been trying to establish contact with a parent. When the parent finally agrees to come to the school, the only day that is convenient for the parent is a day that the counselor is not scheduled to be in that school. Or consider another case in which a parent feels an urgent need to discuss a child's problem with the guidance counselor, but the counselor will not be available at that school for several days. The implications of these situations are manifold and could prove serious.

Finally, but perhaps most important, the fact that the counselor had to divide her time between two schools obstructed the consistent relationship with the children that is necessary if the counselor is to give them the help that they need. Once more, consider a hypothetical case of a child who is just beginning to establish a warm relationship with the guidance counselor and wishes to see the counselor about some problem. If the counselor is not available for several days, the child may find a solution to his problem but there is no way to measure the resultant deterioration that may have occurred in his relationship with the counselor. Similarly, if a child is having a problem in the classroom and the teacher feels that it will be beneficial for the child to see the counselor, but the counselor is unavailable for several days, the opportunity for the counselor to help the child and to further her relationship with the child is missed.

As described in the program guide, the educational (guidance) assistants' duties were extensive and diversified. In practice, the educational assistants' primary duty was to act as tutors. The educational assistants met weekly for one hour with individual children or small groups of children. The main emphasis in these tutorial sessions was remedial help in reading. Observations of these sessions revealed that a warm relationship had been established between the children and the assistants. Perhaps because of the individual attention directed toward them, the children responded positively to the tasks that were undertaken. However, one serious drawback was the lack of communication between the educational assistants and the classroom teachers concerning the level of work that the child was accomplishing in the classroom and the nature of the work that the child was doing with the educational assistants.

The family assistant at P.S. 92 reported that she had visited from five to ten parents in their homes. She did not have an exact count of the number of parents visited. The greater portion of her time (approximately 80 percent) was spent in a tutorial capacity with individual or small groups of children. There was no family assistant at P.S. 175.

Training of Personnel

Neither of the educational assistants had training for their job before beginning work, and the family assistant indicated that she had had only one day of training. At P.S. 175, the educational assistant indicated that she had received no on-the-job training while the educational assistant at P.S. 92 said that she had received three hours per week. However, this training was in a general class for educational assistants provided by the district and did not directly relate to the duties of the Motivation for Learning program. In spite of the small amount of training provided, both educational assistants felt that they had received sufficient help for their jobs. The family assistant, on the other hand, who indicated that she had received one hour per day of on-the-job training by the guidance counselor, felt that she needed more help in order to fulfill the requirements of her job. However, the help that she felt she needed was not more training, but rather was more and better books and equipment.

Of the twenty teachers who were interviewed, nine indicated that they had received orientation or planning help before screening the children for the program. Of these nine, seven felt that it was adequate to enable them to rate the children appropriately, while two thought that it was only partially adequate. However, fourteen of the teachers interviewed said they had adequate knowledge prior to the orientation sessions to rate the children approriately, and three felt that they had partially adequate knowledge prior to the orientation sessions. Only three felt that they did not have adequate knowledge prior to the orientation sessions to rate the children appropriately.

Although one of the seven responding teachers had over ten hours of planning sessions with the guidance counselor after the children were selected for the program, and six had from two to six hours, only two of these seven teachers felt that the planning sessions helped them to better identify children who needed help. Three of the seven teachers indicated that the planning sessions did not help them to better identify children who needed help because they only discussed the children in the program already identified as needing help. Two of the teachers did, however, indicate that the planning sessions helped them identify problems that they were unaware of prior to the sessions.

Working Relationships with the Counselor

Overall, the working relationship between counselor and paraprofessionals appeared extremely favorable. The two educational assistants and the family assistant indicated that they were responsible to the guidance counselor and that they worked closely with her. In contrast, one of the educational assistants and the family assistant said that they had very little contact with the twenty-three classroom teachers.

On the other hand, only seven classroom teachers, of the twenty interviewed, said they had a close working relationship with the guidance counselor. Most of these teachers were from P.S. 92 in which the program had been operating for a longer period of time. P.S. 92 was also the school in which the guidance counselor spent three days a week. Four teachers indicated that they received materials and suggestions from the guidance counselor or exchanged information with her regarding the children and program. Seven indicated that they had very little contact with the counselor. One said that there was little time, but the results were adequate. One teacher from P.S. 175 did not know the guidance counselor.

Responses Concerning the Evaluation of the Program

While one of the educational assistants rated the overall program as excellent and the other rated it as good, both gave as the reason for their evaluation the fact that the program is of real benefit to the children. The family assistant rated the program as having great possibilities but indicated that the program is too new to evaluate it more fully. Eleven of the teachers offered no opinion on the effectiveness of the program, stating that the program was too new or that they did not know enough about it to evaluate it. However, three rated the program as excellent and another three rated it as good. Again, it is interesting to note that the three who rated the program as excellent were at P.S. 92 where the program had been in operation longer. Although only two of the teachers felt that the program had helped the children, another teacher felt that it could have been more effective if more time could be spent with the students. The one who rated the program as poor stated that the program had no obvious effect on the children.

In spite of the fact that eleven teachers of the twenty interviewed, would not evaluate the program and another three rated it fair to poor, all but two wished to have the program available to their classes next year if possible. Five of the eighteen who wished the program continued said they desired to continue the program in order to provide children with individual attention that teachers are not ordinarily able to give. Another four wished to have the program continued because they felt that it offered help to the children in the earlier grades before their problems increased in the upper grades. Other reasons given varied from the opinion that it had been of tremendous help to the children -- to the belief that it offered a new approach to individualized guidance. Only one teacher indicated that she did not know what the program did and therefore, could not say if she wished to have it available to her class next year or not.

Responses Concerning the Attitude of Paraprofessionals toward Their Jobs

Both of the educational assistants reported that they liked very much what they were doing and indicated that their work meant more than just a job to them because they liked working with children. They further indicated that they viewed themselves as an important part of a "team" and felt that the work they were doing was important because they were helping the children.

Although the family assistant indicated that she felt very much needed for the work that she was doing and that the work almost always meant more to her than just a job, she only liked her job somewhat. She further indicated that she felt that she was an important part of a team and that the work that she was doing was important; however, she felt that she needed more skills to do her job and that she was not developing these skills with the limited training she was given.

One of the educational assistants reported that her attitude toward the school had not changed since becoming an educational assistant, and that she "had no complaints" about the school. The other educational assistant, however, indicated that her opinion of the school had become less favorable and that she was disillusioned with the schools in general. The family assistant indicated that her opinion of the school had only changed to the extent that her experience as a family assistant emphasized those problems in the schools of which she was already aware. Both educational assistants and the family assistant said that they would like to be employed in their same capacity in this program again next year because their duties were rewarding. The family assistant also stated that she would like to continue in the program because she believed it would improve.

Teachers' Rating of Student Progress in the Program

Teachers were asked to rate the amount of change in the pupils during the program. But because the program was in operation for such a short period of time, the validity of any attempt to measure behavioral change in the children is questionable. One cannot expect behavior to change perceptibly within a two to three month period as the result of a guidance program in which the majority of the students participated only one hour per week.

This view is substantiated by the fact that ten teachers indicated that the program was too new for them to observe any change in the children and therefore, they did not fill out post-rating scales for nineteen of the children.

Twenty-eight of the fifty-three children in the program at P.S. 92 and P.S. 175 were rated. The other children were not rated because of teacher replacements and pupil absences.

Of the eight children who were rated at P.S. 175, only two of them showed change in any area. One showed improvement in his ability to get along with the teacher, and one showed improvement in his sense of humor. No change was observed in academic achievement. One teacher at P.S. 175 did state that the two children from her class who were in the program had improved generally. However, her class was the top I.G.C. class and was participating in a special program under the direction of the Institute for Developmental Studies. Because so many other factors were operating on her children, she could not attribute the improvement of the children to the effect of the Motivation for Learning program.

Of the twenty children who were rated at P.S. 92, eight showed improvement in at least one area and two children showed improvement in academic achievement. The most outstanding areas of observed improvement were related to the children's ability to adjust to school procedures and to relate to others. For example, seven children improved in their willingness to follow school routine. Six showed improvement in their ability to get along with other children. Three children improved in their ability to behave in a flexible, yielding manner and six became better behaved in classroom situations.

The program seemed generally to develop a more positive self-image. Five children who were shy and quiet became less so, and similarly five became less inhibited. One child showed negative change, but the classroom teacher attributed this to increased pressures from home. She stated that the child had previously been repressing her feelings but after participating in the program she was now able to release some of her anxiety. Another child, according to the teacher, showed improvement in behavior upon entering the program but had regressed to her previous patterns of behavior so no change could be indicated. A third child could not be rated because she did not attend school often enough for the teacher to evaluate her behavior.

Parent Opinion

Fourteen out of fifty-seven parents whose children were in the program were interviewed. Only eight knew that their children were participating in a guidance program, in spite of the fact that two who did not know said that their children often told them about the things that they did in school, and another three who did not know said that their children sometimes told them about the things that they did in school. Furthermore, four of these uninformed parents have met their children's teachers. However, in view of the fact that eleven of the teachers felt that the program was too new or that they did not know enough about it to evaluate it, perhaps it is not so surprising that they did not mention it to the parents. Parents might also have discovered that their children were participants in the Motivation for Learning program through the family assistant, but of the parents interviewed, five who did not know their children were participating said that they had never been visited by a family assistant and one reported that a family assistant had attempted to visit while she was not home.

Of the eight parents who knew that their children were in the Motivation for Learning program, seven said that their children told them about their guidance sessions. One parent said her child told her about the guidance counselor and five told their parents about the kinds of things that they did during these sessions. One parent said that her child told her about the educational assistant. Four reported that their children brought home things that they made during their guidance sessions; the other four said that their children had not.

Four of the eight parents who knew that their children were in the program reported that their children seemed to like it very much, and two reported that their children seemed to like it better than their regular school classes. Only one parent did not know how her child felt about the guidance sessions. However, six of the parents felt that the program was helping their children. One reported that she did not know whether the program was helping her children and one said that the program was not helping.

Only two of the parents knew the guidance counselor; one of them rated her very effective and the other one could offer no opinion because she had met her only briefly.

Two of the parents indicated that they felt the Motivation for Learning program was okay as is, one felt that there should be more parental involvement, and another one felt that more individual help should be provided for the children.

All eight of the parents who knew their children were in the program and all six of those who did not know that their children were in the program indicated that they would contact the school for help if their children were having problems in school.

Discussion of the Program at P.S. 28

As mentioned previously, P.S. 28 was selected late in the year as an alternate school for the Motivation for Learning program. Since this school had three full-time guidance counselors on its staff, the Motivation for Learning guidance counselor did not direct the program here.

The basic operating principle of the program at P.S. 28 was a concentrated effort on a few individual students rather than a generalized effort for many students. The children selected were to be 1) non-achievers, 2) disruptive in the classroom and 3) those who, it was believed, would benefit by a one-to-one relationship with a black male model. Four children were selected by the guidance counselors to participate in the program.

The children met individually with the educational assistant for one hour each day. Although some attempt was made to establish a warm relationship through recreational activities, the major emphasis was upon remedial academic help. As a matter of fact, one of the four participants was dropped from the program during the week of May 19th because the educational assistant felt that he was unable to motivate the child to study; i.e., the child was interested in spending time with the educational assistant as long as the activities in which he participated were recreational and not educational.

The family assistant's primary responsibility was to visit families at home. However, she did not confine her visits to the families of the three children in the Motivation for Learning program (one had been dropped) but also visited families of children who were in the regular guidance program. In fact, the one parent interviewed who had a child in the Motivation for Learning program said that she had not been visited by the family assistant. The family assistant also indicated that some of her responsibilities were to help the guidance counselor with the students and with records and paper work.

In summary, the program started late in all schools and thus was not able to reach all its goals. Nevertheless, most of the professional and paraprofessional staff wish to have the program continued because it offers the possibility of meaningful individual help to students. Even though some of the twenty-three teachers felt that the program had not been in operation long enough for them to rate the children's progress, the ratings that were obtained suggest that the program is contributing to improved pupil motivation. Also, the parents who knew that their children were participating in the program felt that it was helpful and that their children enjoyed it. A more definitive evaluation can be expected only after the program has been in operation over a longer period of time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the previously expressed objections to the program by the community corporations and the fact that the program has made rather slow progress, the entire concept of the program should be re-evaluated to determine if it should be continued. If it is continued the following recommendations should be considered:

1. Time must be allotted for planning prior to the initial starting date of the project.

2. Staff roles should be defined more precisely and staff functions more clearly delineated. This kind of definition should also help establish better working relationships with other school personnel.

3. Communication regarding the program between the guidance counselor and the teachers should be improved.

4. Teachers should be given assistance in identifying the problems that might affect children's school performance. Some teachers indicated that they could benefit from such help.

5. If the program is to operate in more than one school, a full-time guidance counselor should be provided for each school.

6. More training is needed for the paraprofessionals and educational assistants who work in the program.

7. There should be improved communication between the guidance counselor and the parents. This may take the form of parental workshops, newsletters, or individual contact.

8. Follow-up visits by family assistants to homes of children who participate in the program are extremely important and should be increased.

CHAPTER V

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN LANGUAGE ARTS AND READING IMPROVEMENT FOR GRADES ONE, TWO, AND THREE, DISTRICT 7, BRONX

INTRODUCTION

The plan of this chapter will be first to describe the goals of the project, its target population, and the projected duties of the staff. Next, the project as it actually operated will be evaluated. The evaluation was based on interviews with key personnel in the project, teachers, paraprofessionals and parents. Finally, recommendations for improvement of the project will be presented. The comments about the quality of some of the activities and procedures in the program were derived from discussions with the program director and informal observations by the project evaluator.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

This program is a recycling and an expansion of a program funded under Title I during the school year 1967-68. It was to consist of three parts: setting up a reading room in eighteen elementary schools, holding a weekly workshop in each school for parents, and publishing a reading newsletter twice during the period of the program. The personnel were to include a district coordinator, a parent program assistant, eighteen teacher coordinators, eighteen family assistants, and eighteen family workers.

According to the project description the goals of this project were:

1. To establish closer cooperation between parent and teacher in improving the child's reading and language skills.

2. To help parents understand their roles in language arts programs, and to give parents an understanding of ways in which the child is being taught language arts and to explain materials in use and their purposes.

3. To train parents to assist their own children in learning reading and language arts skills.

4. To improve school-community relations.

5. To improve achievement in the basic skills subjects.[1]

---

[1] The University of The State of New York, Project Summary Form, District 7, Bronx, N.Y., p. 5.

The workshops were to include 1) demonstrations with children and classroom teachers, with parents as observers, to explain methodology, use of materials, and procedures; 2) activities demonstrating ways parents could help their children at home, such as collecting items from the home that could be used as sources of reading and language arts discussion, creating materials to demonstrate the use of reading and language arts skills, using the public and school libraries, demonstrating how language arts and reading are integrated with other curriculum areas such as science, mathematics, music, etc.

The project also proposed distributing a newsletter to the parents of children in grades 1, 2, and 3. The content of the newsletter was to come from the teachers and parents in the district. Parents of preschool children were also invited to join the workshops in the nearest public school. These activities were under the direct supervision of the district's early childhood supervisor.

The target population was the parents of children in grades 1, 2 and 3 who were attending both the public and non-public schools of District 7. The program was designed to involve 630 parents (thirty-five parents who would regularly attend the workshops at each of the eighteen participating schools) from an estimated parent population of 13,500. The parents were recruited on a volunteer basis.

The staff was to include a parent program assistant, assigned to the district supervisor. The parent program assistant was to help set up the workshops in the individual schools by acquiring films, speakers, etc. and to work with the teacher trainer, school grade coordinator, school family assistant, early childhood supervisor, and reading consultant in planning the program for the parents. In addition, she was to help set up the reading rooms, serve as a liaison between the schools and the district office, collect and edit data for the newsletter, and assist in gathering materials for the reading kits to be distributed to the parents.

A school family assistant (parent coordinator) chosen by the principal and Parent's Association was to be assigned to each school. Her duties were to set up and maintain the reading room; to contact the parents and elicit their cooperation and participation in the program; to coordinate school and district staff; to collect materials for the newsletter; to attend district-wide meetings, and to handle parent snack funds.

At each school a family worker was to be available to take care of siblings and younger children in a school area designated for this purpose while the parent was attending the workshops.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

The total pupil population of District 7, Bronx, is 32,487, with the following ethnic distribution:

Puerto Rican	64.00 percent
Black	31.00
Other Spanish	2.00
Other	2.00
Oriental	1.00

The estimated pupil population in grades 1, 2 and 3 was 11,529 and the parent population was estimated to be 13,500.

Figures received from the district's early childhood supervisor estimated the total parent involvement in the workshops to be 644. However, this figure includes those parents who attended an occasional workshop and does not describe the smaller number who attended regularly.

The parental involvement program was conducted in the following elementary schools in District 7:

P.S. 5, 18, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 37, 40, 43, 48, 49, 51, 65, 124, 154, 157, 161.

The following schools were chosen for intensive study because of their ethnic population, level of parent attendance, and geographical location within the school district: P.S. 18 and 43 were schools with a high parent attendance, P.S. 48 and 161 had a medium parent attendance and P.S. 27 and 124 had low parent attendance. The ethnic make-up of all of the schools in District 7 is approximately sixty-five to seventy percent Spanish-speaking of which the majority are Puerto Rican and thirty to thirty-five percent black.

According to the proposal, the workshops were scheduled to begin on September 30, 1968 and end on May 29, 1969.

In the following schools, P.S. 18, 27, 43, 48, 124, 161, the workshops began as late as the first week of November and ended the third week of June. The lateness was due to the teachers' strike which affected the beginning of the school year.

The total number of workshops held were:

P.S.	18	25
	27	25
	43	29
	48	25
	124	22
	161	21

In the six schools evaluated, the workshops were held variously in the auditorium, cafeteria, a classroom, and the community room for parents. Owing to lack of physical space in overcrowded buildings, four schools (P.S. 18, 43, 48, 124) were not able to provide a reading room for the program. Two schools (P.S. 27 and 161) had a community room for parents and the workshops were held there.

The average parent attendance for the workshops in the six schools that were evaluated in detail was:

P.S.	18	34
	27	8
	43	15
	48	10
	124	15
	161	20

The average attendance was determined from the number of parents at each session and does not reflect the fact that different parents may have been involved in the various sessions.

Some of the materials used for the workshops were: kits from SRA; materials from Ginn Publishers for parents, workbooks for parents to reinforce work with children; a picture dictionary for parents to work with children at home. Other materials included: Bank Street Readers; Scott-Foresman word games, and phonetics workshops, teaching English as a second language.

A list of topics covered in the workshops follows:

1. How Your Child Grows in Word Power
2. Children Learn to Read Through Their Own Experiences
3. How Children Learn to Understand What They Read
4. Teaching Manuscript Writing
5. Teaching Compound Words
6. Choral Speaking
7. Reading Through Pictures
8. Phonics Program
9. Reading in Other Subjects
10. The Bi-Lingual Program
11. Behavior Problems-Helping Your Child at Home
12. Reading and Social Studies
13. Experience Charts
14. The School Library Program
15. Visit to the Public Library
16. Reading and the Art Program
17. Word Games for Fun
18. The Beginning Reading Program
19. Reading and the Science Program

20. Individualized Reading Program
21. The Speech Program
22. Consonant Sounds
23. Dictionary Skills
24. Reading for Comparison
25. Word Blending Skills
26. Number Facts
27. Guidance in Reading Disabilities
28. Learning through Pantomime
29. A Basal Reading Lesson
30. How to Improve Language Ability
31. Listening Skills
32. The Physical Education Program
33. Reading and the Music Program
34. Attendance and How Parents Can Help
35. The New Math
36. Visit to SOMPSEC (cultural center in South Bronx established under the auspices of Title III)
37. Riddles, Rhymes and Puzzles
38. Reading Tests
39. The Alphabet - How It Is Taught
40. Penmanship - Grades 2 and 3
41. Rhyming Endings
42. Compound Words
43. Dental Hygiene
44. The Needs of Children
45. Help Your Child Enjoy Poetry
46. Techniques in Word Study
47. Determining Sequence
48. Negro History and Hispanic History
49. How to Help with Homework
50. Varied Reading Games
51. Dramatization in the Reading Program
52. Children's Literature
53. T.V. and Reading
54. Visual and Auditory Perception
55. Book Report Format
56. The Homework Helpers Program
57. The Spelling Program
58. Delayed Language and Speech
59. The Public Library
60. Crossword Puzzles
61. Follow-up Discussions of Classroom Observations
62. Songs and Poems that Teach

The newsletter, The Readers' Reader, was given to every child in grades one to three in all of the elementary schools in the district to take home to their parents. It includes helpful hints to parents for home participation with their children in reading as well as other related subject areas.

Of the teachers conducting one or more workshops, nineteen used books; seven used commercially developed materials; seven used objects from parents' and children's environment; fifteen used personally created materials; two used audio-visual materials; seven used blackboard, paper and pencil; and three used games.

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

The success of the workshop was directly related to the industriousness and creativity of the coordinators who had the responsibility in the various schools.

At the workshops visited, the interest and enthusiasm of the parents present were apparent. From responses in the interviews of parents who attended one or more workshops, it was evident that most parents felt involved in the education of their children and seemed interested in learning how they could help their children.

Attendance was maintained at just about the same level throughout the course of the workshop programs, although the attendance varied from school to school. In all six schools the spirit of the parents was good. The discussion leaders were not always clear, however, and often did not allow sufficient time for Spanish translations. Non-public school parents did not participate in the six schools evaluated.

Reporting

A file of the Monthly Evaluation Reports which were sent by each of the 18 family assistants was kept in the district office. The reports were routinely requested by the project director. The monthly evaluation report included the following data: a) the number of parents attending workshops, b) the number of home visits made by the family assistant, and c) the number of parents reached informally.

In addition, the Family Assistant Logs, also routinely required by the project director, were kept monthly and included: a) a description of the workshop activities, b) the attendance record, and c) a list of names of the parents who attended.

The Staff

The parent program assistant assigned to the district supervisor worked only at the beginning of the program and had to terminate her duties because of illness. The district coordinator reported that the lack of current data was due to the absence of the parent program assistant.

The district coordinator held regular monthly meetings with the coordinators and the family assistants. She admitted the difficulty of combined professional and paraprofessional group meetings, but was optimistic about future gatherings.

The district coordinator had duties other than the Parental Involvement program but seemed to coordinate the program well. In addition, she felt that the Parental Involvement program would progress in all of the schools within the district because the community was one in which parents were genuinely concerned about the welfare of their children and were willing to become more actively involved in the schools' programs.

The interviews of coordinators, teachers, and parents in the program were conducted by experienced interviewers who were hired for this purpose.

The ethnic background and sex distribution of the respondents was as follows:

A) School Teacher Coordinators
N = 6
male = 0
female = 6
5 White
1 Black
0 Spanish-speaking

B) Teachers Who Conducted Workshops
N = 30
male = 5
female = 25
22 White
6 Black
2 Spanish-speaking

C) Family Assistants
N = 6
male = 0
female = 6
0 White
1 Black
5 Spanish-speaking

D) Parents Who Attended Workshops Regularly
N = 30
male = 0
female = 30
1 White
7 Black
22 Spanish-speaking

E) Parents Who Attended Workshops Sometimes
N = 30
male = 0
female = 30
0 White
10 Black
20 Spanish-speaking

F) Parents Who Never Attended
N = 30
0 White
17 Black
13 Spanish-speaking

Responses of the School Teacher Coordinators

There were eighteen teachers who, as coordinators in the program, had the direct responsibility in each school of working with the family assistants to involve parents in the program. Nine of the eighteen teacher coordinators rated the overall program as "good." Fifteen of the teacher coordinators had no planning or orientation sessions before they began to teach one or more workshops. Three had one or two days of training.

All but one of the coordinators said they had a good working relationship with the family assistant. The one assistant who had a poor relationship with her coordinator felt that the coordinator should have been Spanish-speaking, and that Spanish-speaking parents had difficulty relating to the coordinator.

Responses of the Teachers Who Conducted One or More Workshops

Teachers who conducted the workshops were usually recruited by the teacher coordinator in the schools and, in most instances, conducted a workshop in the school where they currently taught. Several resource teachers were secured from the district office. Eleven teachers rated the overall program as "good," and nine as "fair."

The parents' reactions to the workshop lesson was rated"enthusiastic"by fifteen of the teachers interviewed.

Responses of the Family Assistants

There were eighteen family assistants, whose duties were to contact parents and assist the coordinator with the workshop. They were usually parents themselves.

Of the six family assistants interviewed, none had been employed as a family assistant for more than one year. Five had had no training for the job before they began work on this project. All worked eleven to fifteen hours a week. Five indicated that they liked their work very much. Two said their responsibilities included working directly with children, and all stated that their duties included visiting parents in the home and working with parents in the school. In responses to the question, "How many parents have you visited?" three had made less than five visits, three had made six to ten, one had made eleven to twenty, and three had made more than thirty. All reported that the parents with whom they visited were friendly. When rating the coordinators, four found their coordinator very effective, one rated her coordinator as effective, and one rated her coordinator as very ineffective.

All had favorable opinions of the school; four rated the overall Parental Involvement program as excellent, and two as good. Of the six family assistants interviewed, five expressed a desire to be a family assistant next year, and all found their duties rewarding.

Three of the family assistants had completed high school and one had had one to two years of college.

Responses of the Parents

Thirty parents who attended the workshops regularly, thirty who attended the workshops sometimes, and thirty who had never attended the workshops were interviewed. Of the thirty who attended regularly, twenty indicated that they found out about the workshops by way of a newsletter from school. Twenty-four felt that the purpose of the workshops was to teach parents how to help their children learn. The same number felt that the workshops they had attended gave them ideas about how to help their children learn to read, and all but two indicated they had tried to use these ideas with their children. Twenty-five of the thirty regular parents felt that the ideas they received at the workshops had helped their children learn to read better. When asked, "Have you been visited by a family assistant?", all but six answered "no." Thirteen parents had no suggestions to make in reference to the question, "What would you suggest to improve the workshops?"

Of the sample of thirty parents interviewed who sometimes attended workshops, twenty-seven would like to attend more workshops when possible. Sixteen indicated their reasons for not attending more sessions were their household duties and the problem of younger children. Twenty-five of the thirty parents were unaware that there were babysitting services available for those attending the workshops; eighteen said that they had left their children with the family worker at the school. Ten parents who were employed during the day said that they would attend workshops if they were held in the evenings. Only four parents who sometimes attended workshops had been visited by a family assistant. Twenty-two of these thirty parents who sometimes attended had no suggestions for improving the workshops, while five suggested getting more parents to attend.

Of the thirty parents interviewed who never attended the workshops, twenty indicated that they were aware of the workshops. Twelve of these twenty parents stated that they found out about the workshops from posters. None had found out about the workshops through the newsletter or by a visit from a family assistant. Nine parents indicated that they would like to attend the workshops if possible; two said "perhaps," and another five said "don't know." Two main reasons were given for inability to attend; ten said that they were employed during the day, and seven said that they were too busy with home and children. Another four said that they were unable to attend because of language difficulties. Twelve indicated that they would be interested in attending the workshops if they were held during the evening, but eleven said that they would not. Only nine of these thirty parents who had not attended received the newsletter, but four of those who did receive it indicated that it had given them ideas about how to help their children learn to read. None of these parents had been visited by a family assistant. However, twenty-seven had met their child's teacher, and all but one felt free to contact their child's teacher to discuss his or her progress. Similarly, all of the respondents indicated that they would feel free to contact someone at school if their children were having a problem.

Parents' Reactions to "The Readers' Reader"

Of the thirty parents who attended the workshops regularly, twenty-four received The Readers' Reader, while six did not. To the question of "Has it given you any ideas about how to help your child read?", eighteen answered "yes" and six said "sometimes." None said "no."

Of the thirty parents who attended the workshops sometimes, twenty said that they had received The Readers' Reader while ten did not. Fourteen parents said that it gave them ideas of how to help their child read, three indicated that it did not help them, while three said it helped sometimes.

Of the thirty parents who never attended the workshops, twenty-one never received The Readers' Reader, while nine did. Six of those receiving it indicated that The Readers' Reader gave them ideas about how to help their child learn to read. Two indicated that it did not help them and one said it helped sometimes.

In summary, the program generally reached its goals, although only a limited number of parents were involved. The data indicate that the parents who did attend the workshops found them beneficial in teaching them how to help their children learn. However, the goal to set up a reading room in each of the eighteen participating schools was not met because of the lack of physical space in overcrowded schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There should be better supervision and coordination at the district level. There was very little districtwide coordination of the programs.

2. The present program, if continued, might be expanded to include such areas as basic consumer education, sex education, personal hygiene, infant and child care, and basic education for both English and non-English speaking parents. Inclusion of other areas might increase parent interest and also parent attendance.

3. The topic for each of the sessions should be defined at the beginning of the program so that the teacher responsible for conducting a given session has ample preparation time. Most of the teacher-coordinators reported that they did not have time to plan for the sessions that they were responsible for.

4. Monthly training sessions should be held for family assistants, coordinators, and teachers who conduct workshops, with follow-ups at the district level.

5. The family assistants should start prior to the beginning of school to inform parents of the workshops.

6. More home visits should be made by the family assistant with regular follow-ups made by the coordinator to increase parent attendance.

7. A reading room should be established in each of the elementary schools participating in the Parental Involvement program. It should also serve as a place for the workshops to be held.

8. The workshop sessions should provide time for the parents to construct games or visual aids that could be used with the children at home.

9. Workshops should allow parents more opportunities to observe classes of children in action, both in a class setting and in the workshops.

CHAPTER VI

CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION AND VIDEO TAPE RECORDING FOR IMPROVING INSTRUCTION, DISTRICT 12, BRONX

INTRODUCTION

The plan of this chapter will be first to describe the goals of the project, its target population and the projected duties of the staff. Next, the project as it actually operated will be evaluated. The evaluation was based on interviews with key personnel in the project, teachers, paraprofessionals and parents. Finally, recommendations for improvement of the project will be presented. The comments about the quality of some of the activities and procedures in the program were derived from discussions with the program director and informal observations by the project evaluator.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Closed Circuit Television and Video Tape Recording for Improving Instruction program was a recycling of a program funded under Title I during the summer of 1968. It was designed to improve the instruction of educationally deprived pupils in the schools of District 12. There were two main aspects of the program. The first was to train teachers in the techniques and methodology of teaching through the use of video tapes. The second was to make high quality instruction available to the students through closed circuit television.

The goals of the project stated in the project description were: "1) to raise the academic levels of the pupils; 2) to instill in the teachers a more realistic image of themselves, of the pupils, and the community; 3) to train teachers in the art and science of teaching, and 4) to actively involve the community in many of the processes of the schools."[1]

According to the proposal, taped lessons of academic and/or enrichment value (e.g., Afro-American-Puerto Rican history and culture, excellent lessons given by master teachers in each of the academic areas, etc.) were to be produced and made available to all of the schools in the district. These lessons were to involve classes from the individual participating schools. The teachers were to develop material for use in their normal classroom instructional settings so that they could use it in the video tape sessions. Actual classroom situations, panel discussions, dramatizations, interviews, lectures, and demonstrations were among the types of programs to be taped. The tapes were to be viewed by the teachers as a part of an in-service teacher training program.

---

[1] The University of The State of New York, Project Summary Form, District 12, Bronx, N.Y., p. 19.

Some academic areas were to be correlated, so that in many instances a "core" approach could be used. Several of these included combinations of art-music, social studies, Afro-American-Puerto Rican history and culture, mathematics-science, etc.

The project was to be implemented at Junior High Schools 44, 98, 133 and 136. It was budgeted at $15,959.

Although no specific program population was specified, the proposal suggested that many teachers and all of the students in the participating junior high schools (J.H.S. 44, 98, 133, 136) would be involved in the program.

A coordinator was employed to direct the program in all four schools. He was to plan and administer the program so that: "1) many pupils and teachers will be exposed to lessons given by expert teachers; 2) the enrichment of one subject area will be accomplished through the merging of related materials from other subject areas; 3) children will achieve success through participation and personal involvement in vitalized academic areas; and 4) pupils will develop a constructive self-concept through an awareness of their cultural heritage and traditions."

One teacher from each of the four participating schools was assigned to coordinate the program in each school. They were to be trained to understand television procedures (i.e., how to operate and maintain television equipment), and to perform various other duties related to the television workshops. They were also to create material which would help produce a positive student self-image and could be distributed to the other schools in the district.

Three educational assistants were to be assigned to each of the four schools. Their major responsibilities were to operate and maintain equipment, to tape and edit lessons, and to plan and direct taping lessons. They were to work two hours per day for twenty-six days.

Consultants, who were familiar with the operation of television equipment, were to be engaged to assist in training the school personnel in taping and in directing the taping sessions.

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

The project was operational for most of the school year in only one school, J.H.S. 136. It was operational for only a short time in J.H.S. 98 and 133. It was never operational in J.H.S. 44.

Many factors contributed to the non-functioning of the program. Equipment and material such as cameras, tripods, monitors, video recorders, tapes, and reels were to be provided for each school. However, some equipment had to be shared, and there was difficulty in moving it from school to school. Another source of trouble was getting broken equipment repaired. The repair companies were reluctant to work on school equipment because of delays in payment. Consequently, schools were often unable to get service. In the case of J.H.S. 44, the equipment was broken and never repaired.

The operation of the program was further delayed because it took so long to train personnel to operate and maintain equipment. Student and teacher participation in filming the tapes was irregular because the tapes were filmed after school hours and attendance was voluntary and non-remunerative. Some teachers quit because they were not paid.

Finally, the fact that the taping sessions were not pre-planned and pre-arranged impeded the program's progress greatly.

Operation of the Project in J.H.S. 133, J.H.S. 98 and J.H.S. 136

J.H.S. 133

The two paraprofessionals who were assigned to the coordinator at J.H.S. 133 attended training classes twice a week for several weeks. However, broken equipment delayed beginning the operation of the program until after March 1969. Before this date the equipment had been in and out of the repair shop four times. Only seven tapes were made during March, April, and May.

J.H.S. 98

No paraprofessionals were assigned to the project at J.H.S. 98. The coordinator, who was also the assistant principal, borrowed paraprofessionals from J.H.S. 136 and used students to assist him in the program. Eight tapes were made, but were not widely circulated in the school because of lack of planning.

J.H.S. 136

Consultants were employed to train the paraprofessionals in the program at J.H.S. 136. All other training was done by the coordinator who was an experienced television script writer. Fifteen tapes were made in this school. This was more than any of the other schools in the program produced. The tapes were not widely used, however. The teachers who made the tapes were selected on the basis of their interest, charm, ability to project on camera, and ability to speak well, as determined by the coordinator. No special curriculum was developed for use in the tapes; the topics for the tapes were taken from the regular school curriculum.

Opinions of Teachers Who Made Tapes

The fifteen teachers who participated in making tapes were all interviewed: Seven said that they had become involved in taping lessons because they were asked to come and observe a lesson, five said that they had volunteered, and three were assigned by their principal. None of the teachers had had previous experience in television teaching.

The subject areas that were taped were: industrial arts, reading, social studies, science, English literature, music, and mathematics. Seven of the teachers interviewed chose the subject matter that they wished to tape, five chose their teaching subject areas, and three were informed of the subject matter that they were to tape. Eleven taped a lesson that they had taught previously. Seven attended training sessions prior to taping, and one indicated that she had received a short briefing, but seven received no training. Eight of the fifteen teachers interviewed rated the overall functioning of the project as excellent, three rated it good, two rated it fair, and two had no opinion. To improve the program, two suggested establishing criteria for defining a "good teacher tape" and a "poor teacher tape," six suggested more planning sessions, four suggested better organization, and two suggested more follow-ups. Five suggested expansion of the program.

The tapes were not used in a formal way for teacher training. The fifteen teachers who made the tapes looked at their own tapes and occasionally viewed another teacher's.

Opinions of Paraprofessionals

Four paraprofessionals were interviewed. Three of them had been employed as paraprofessionals for seven to nine months while the fourth had been employed for one to three months. Two indicated that they had worked on the Closed Circuit Television and Video Tape Recording program last summer. The other two did not. The two paraprofessionals who worked last summer were employed in the same school this year.

Of the paraprofessionals interviewed, three had received two months of training prior to beginning work while one had received two weeks of training. Three were trained in a large group by an outside agency; the other was trained individually "on the job" by the program director. The areas in which they received training were:

	No.
operation of monitor	3
operation of reading machines	3
operation of cameras	3
editing of films	1
sound mixer	2

All liked what they were doing and felt needed, but three felt that they had not received enough training in the operation of the equipment. Two worked ten hours a week and two worked twenty-five hours a week. Three indicated that in their opinion the program was very effective, and one said it was effective. All rated the director as effective. When asked for suggestions for improving the program, one suggested hiring more paraprofessionals and three suggested more training for teachers and paraprofessionals.

In summary, this program did not become operational owing to a number of administrative and mechanical problems. A total of only fifteen tapes were made, and they were not used for teacher training.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Major recommendation: The entire concept of this project should be re-evaluated and the decision concerning its continuance should be made in the light of other prorities in the district. In making this re-evaluation the following recommendations should be considered:

1. The organization and administration of the project should be greatly improved.

2. Teachers should play active roles in the planning and use of the tapes.

3. More adequate training should be provided for the teachers so that they may develop competence in TV teaching techniques, and can understand procedures of how to operate and maintain TV equipment.

4. More training should be given to the paraprofessionals; this training should include operation and maintenance of equipment, taping, editing, planning lessons, and directing of taping.

5. Materials and equipment, such as cameras, tripods, monitors, video recorders, etc., should be kept in operating condition and should be adequate in number. Possibly a contractual agreement for repair service should be made with a reputable firm before the project begins to operate.

6. The in-service teachers who participate should be compensated.

7. All tapings should be pre-planned and pre-arranged.

8. One paraprofessional should be assigned the responsibility of expediting the repair of broken equipment.

9. A centrally located studio for the use of all schools should be established.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Two hundred and sixty-five projects were developed through the process of consultation of the local school district officials with community representatives under the decentralized Title I projects program in 1968-69.

The 265 projects were classified into the following areas:

Type	Rank	Number of Projects
Enrichment	1	44
Experimental	2	40
After School Study Center	3.5	32
Community Involvement	3.5	32
Reading and Language	5	28
Administrative	6	20
Special Help	7	16
Parent Involvement	8	15
Guidance	9	14
Homework Helper	10	9
Teacher Training	11	7
Library Aides	12	6
Independent Evaluation	13	2

The enrichment and the experimental classifications of projects were the first two categories in 1968-69 compared to After School Study Centers and Reading and Language in 1967-68.

The following five projects of the 265 projects developed under the decentralized Title I projects were selected for detailed evaluation in order to obtain some insight into the factors that might influence the success or failure of some of the decentralized projects.

PROJECTS

"Cultural Heritage Implementation Program (CHIP)," District 4, Manhattan. This project, budgeted at $66,803, was designed for 1,200 children in grades 4, 5 and 6 in five schools. The purpose of this project was to arouse the children's interest in current African culture, Afro-American heritage, and Antillean culture through theatrical presentations, and to sustain this interest in order to develop conceptual learning in the classroom sessions.

"Motivation for Learning," District 6, Manhattan. The purpose of this project was to increase the ability of teachers to recognize symptoms of learning disabilities; to identify children between the ages of six and fourteen with learning disabilities, and through a combination of special counseling and supportive help from the parents, to enable the children to overcome their learning disabilities. The project was aimed at 908 children. It was budgeted at $16,594.

"Diagnostic and Remedial Learning Laboratory," District 16, Brooklyn. This project was planned for 3,900 first and second graders in seven schools. Approximately $79,000 was allocated to identify those children who have reading disabilities and to raise their reading ability through the use of special equipment and remedial instruction.

"Parental Involvement in Language Arts and Reading Improvement for Grades 1, 2, 3," District 7, Bronx. Budgeted at $34,700, this project was to involve the parents of 11,529 first through third grade children in eighteen elementary schools. The purpose of the project was to establish closer cooperation between parents and teachers in improving children's reading and language skills.

"Teacher Training Project," District 12, Bronx. The objectives of the project were to provide teachers in four schools with examples of effective and ineffective approaches to teaching a particular subject, and to involve the community in school activities by taping and re-playing the tapes of the teaching sessions at community-school meetings. This project was budgeted at $15,959.

An evaluation of each of the five projects was made through interviews with the project coordinators, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents who were involved in the projects, through observations of certain of the projects in operation, and through empirical data on pupil performance. The results of the detailed evaluations are presented in Sections II through VI of this report.

FINDINGS

All of the projects except the Teacher Training project, which faltered because of a combination of mechanical and administrative problems, were operational. The results of the projects can be viewed as positive or not so positive depending upon the point of view from which the evaluation is taken. If one takes the view that projects must be initiated slowly to work out problems and develop the operational structure for the project, the four projects have been successful because they have succeeded in focusing the energies and resources of the local school district on seeking certain solutions for problems. If, however, one looks for empirical data which reflect the success of the programs in meeting their objectives, the picture is less optimistic. The specific empirical findings are summarized below:

1. In the Reading and Language Arts project the reading performance of the pupils in the program did not improve more than the performance of control classes despite significant gains in performance on the Visual Perception Test by several project classes. The project was operative, however, for only about five months in a school year disturbed by teacher strikes and community unrest. Both the teachers and the parents were enthusiastic about the project, a fact which suggests some success on the part of the project in focusing attention on teaching reading.

2. The Cultural Heritage Implementation Program (CHIP) produced statistically significant differences in knowledge of African and Antillean culture in some classes (7 out of 23 comparisons). The average number of correct answers for the CHIP classes was 50 percent, while the average number of correct answers for the control classes was 44 percent. Most of the children in the program and their parents were enthusiastic about the program.

3. The Motivation for Learning program focused on individual children who had learning problems, but the time during which the project operated was not sufficient for many noticeable changes to take place. Nonetheless, some teachers reported that the attitudes of some of the children toward learning had improved.

4. The Parental Involvement program was a success in that positive attitudes were developed by the parents who attended the workshops, but was not successful in that only a small number of the parents in any given school participated. The involvement of parents, thus, remains as a significant challenge to the schools.

The lack of success of the Parental Involvement program is probably a reflection of the communities' general attitude toward the schools. Some support for this point of view is found in the interviews with representatives of the local anti-poverty agencies and other community groups (see Appendix D) who indicated a lack of trust and confidence in the local school officials. One variation in this pattern was District 16, Brooklyn, where the community representatives felt that the district superintendent was deeply concerned with communicating and working with the community groups. As a result community representatives in District 16 were more positive in their attitude toward the schools.

DISCUSSION

While it is not possible to generalize about all decentralized Title I projects from the five projects evaluated here, certain observations can be made that have relevance to the factors involved in the conduct of decentralized Title I projects.

The major problem in each of the projects seems to be organization. There is a large gap between the operation of the projects and the various administrative mechanisms that must be followed in order to implement them. Too often, requests made for assignment of personnel, purchase of equipment, and changes of schedule were not responded to, or the responses were too late or inadequate.

The cause of this situation is the lack of direct accountability. In this evaluation it was found that there were no consistent attempts on the part of the district superintendents or the community representatives to monitor the projects and attempt to correct problems as they occurred. It is necessary that some individual or group be responsible for knowing what is happening on a day-to-day basis. If something is wrong, steps should be taken immediately to remedy the situation. Admittedly this is a large order, but some answer must be found if various educational innovations are to have a better chance of being successful.

There is a real need for local residents to have some responsibility for controlling education in their communities and, when given it, to be persistent and diligent in their participation in this process. Even if the city system is further decentralized, however, the size and complexity of the local districts (each district contains some 25,000-30,000 pupils) will cause problems and will require even more involvement in education on the part of community representatives.

The question of whether the decentralized planning and operation of Title I projects is an effective educational practice is difficult to answer. If the decentralized projects can be viewed as a trial run for decentralization on a larger scale, one set of conclusions can be drawn. If, on the other hand, the frame of reference is the outcome of the decentralized projects in terms of operationally defined educational objectives, another set of conclusions might be drawn.

As a trial run for decentralization, some important conclusions can be derived about the process of decentralized planning and operation of educational programs. The community representatives feel that, although the school officials are required to consult with community representatives, many school officials do not value the opinions of the community and the school officials do what they want to do anyway. This is not always true, but in those districts where the school officials try to involve the community representatives and utilize their judgments in planning programs, the attitude of the community representatives is more positive. If decentralization of the local districts is to be effective, the community must have a meaningful role in the decision-making process.

Regarding the question of the effectiveness of the decentralized Title I projects, this evaluation has shown that the specific programs that were selected for evaluation varied in terms of their effectiveness. Previous evaluations of centralized projects have also shown variation in effectiveness from school to school. If decentralized planning and conduct of the Title I projects is to be effective, there must be greater participation in planning and monitoring the projects by the community. While there is fiscal accountability to the Board of Education, there is inadequate program accountability to the Board and/or the community. There needs to be more involvement of the community in the process of educational accountability as well as improved performance on the part of school officials in the area of administration and supervision.

Specific Recommendations Concerning Decentralized Title I Programs

1. As was suggested in a previous evaluation of the 1967-68 decentralized Title I projects, more time must be allotted for planning the decentralized Title I programs. Some way should be found to inform each district about the amount of money available to it so that the districts can begin to plan the projects much further in advance, certainly no later than January 15. Also, some projects should be planned and approved for longer than a one-year period.

2. The position of the Title I coordinator is a very difficult and demanding one, with both administrative and program coordination responsibilities. It is recommended that another Title I position be created in each district, namely, supervisor of Title I educational programs. He could function under the Title I coordinator who would have the major responsibility for administrative and financial matters. The supervisor of educational programs could work to oversee the projects on a day-to-day basis and act as a trouble shooter to deal with specific operational problems.

3. Efforts must be intensified to involve community representatives in discussions and decisions about the decentralized educational programs. The community representatives must see to it that someone from their agency or group is constantly in contact with the school in order to obtain information about the specific educational programs in the district. The essential responsibility for involving the community belongs to the school staff, but the community should become more consistent in its communication and interaction with the school officials. Community participation will work effectively if the community leaders are persistent, diligent, and enlightened about local school matters.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Diagnostic and Remedial Learning Laboratory

Page

Reading and Languages -- Teachers A1

Educational Assistants' Responses A9

Parents' Responses A14

Cultural Heritage Implementation Program

Parents' Responses A20

Classroom Teachers' Responses A25

Teacher Aides' Responses A30

Motivation for Learning Program

Classroom Teachers' Responses A37

Parents' Responses A42

Parental Involvement Program

Teachers' Responses A46

Responses of Parents Who Attended Workshops Regularly A53

Responses of Parents Who Attended Workshops Sometimes A57

Responses of Parents Who Never Attended Workshop A61

Closed Circuit Television and Video Tape Recording Program

Responses of Teachers That Were Taped A65

Responses of Teachers Who Have Seen Tapes A70

DIAGNOSTIC AND REMEDIAL LEARNING LABORATORY

Reading and Languages--Teachers

N=14

	# of responses	%
1. How many years have you been a teacher?		
1-4 years	8	57.1
5-9	4	28.5
10-14	2	14.2
2. How many years have you taught 1st grade?		
1 year	2	14.2
2 years	3	21.4
3 years	2	14.2
4 years	1	7.1
5 years	2	14.2
no response	4	28.5
3. How many years have you taught 2nd grade?		
1 year	1	7.1
2 years	4	28.5
3 years	1	7.1
4 years	1	7.1
no response	7	50.0
4. What is the extent of your formal education?		
A.B. degree	13	92.8
MA. degree	1	7.1
Prof. Certificate	1	7.1
5. How many college or in-service courses have you taken that dealt specifically with teaching of reading?		
None	4	28.5
One	1	7.1
Two	0	0
Three	3	21.4
Four	1	7.1
More than 5	3	21.4
No response	2	14.2
6. How much special training did you receive for this program?		
One-two days	0	0
Three-four days	2	14.2
One-two weeks	9	64.2
More than two weeks	1	7.1
None	2	14.2
7. How would you rate the length of this training period? (N -12)		
Adequate	5	41.6
Less than adequate	3	25.0
Inadequate	4	33.3
(Not applic. = 2)		

	# of Responses	%
8. Why? (N = 12)		
Familiarized teachers with machines	4	33.3
Have sample lessons	2	16.6
Laboratory training needed	2	16.6
Overview	2	16.6
Needs more practice with machines	6	50.0
9. How would you rate the quality of this training?(N = 12)		
Excellent	4	33.3
Good	6	50..0
Fair	1	8.3
Poor	1	8.3
(Not applicable =2)		
10. Why?		
More specificity	2	16.6
Practical	5	41.6
Clear	4	33.3
Good preparation	2	16.6
Needs more time	5	41.6
11. In what specific areas should additional training be given?		
Divide class into groups	8	66.6
Presenting the lesson	5	41.6
Reinforcing the skills	6	50.0
Working with slow members of class	10	83.3
Setting up machines for class	2	16.6
Running machines	1	8.3
Working with machines before program begins	2	16.6
Motility training	1	8.3
Non-machine activities	1	8.3
Enrichment	1	8.3
Demonstration lessons on different stages	1	8.3
12. Have you received additional training since the program began?		
Yes	9	64.2
No	5	35.7
13. How often does the training take place? (N = 9)		
Once a month	1	11.1
Two or three meetings	6	66.6
No response	2	22.2
14. How long are the sessions? (N = 9)		
One hour	1	11.1
Two hours	1	11.1
Two and a half hours	1	11.1
Three hours	4	44.4
No response	2	22.2

	# of Responses	%
15. Should there be interview training for teachers in the program?		
Yes	12	85.7
No	1	7.1
No response	1	7.1
16. How many sessions? (N= 12)		
1-5	1	8.3
6-10	3	25.0
11-15	5	41.6
More than 15	2	16.6
No response	1	8.3
17. How long should these sessions be? (N = 12)		
One hour	3	25.0
Two hours	5	41.6
More than two hours	2	16.6
No response	2	16.6
18. How frequently should the sessions be held? (N = 12)		
Once a week	3	25.0
Twice a week	2	16.6
Once a month	2	16.6
Twice a month	3	25.0
No response	2	16.6
19. How would you rate your relationship with the Program Director?		
Excellent	2	14.2
Good	9	64.2
Fair	1	7.1
No opinion	1	7.1
No response	1	7.1
20. Why? (N= 13)		
Available	5	38.4
Helpful	7	53.8
Honest	3	23.0
Similar philosophies	2	15.3
Personality conflict	1	7.6
Haven't met her	1	7.6
21. How can your relationship with the Program Director be improved?		
More contact (N = 13)	6	46.1
By sharing information	1	7.6
Don't know	1	7.6
No response	5	38.4
22. How would you rate your relationship with the reading clinician?		
Excellent	4	28.5
Good	2	14.2
Poor	0	0
N.A.	8	57.1

	# of Responses	%
23. Why? (N= 6)		
Helpful	2	33.3
Cooperative	5	83.3
Provides feedback	1	16.6
24. How can your relationship with the reading clinician be improved? (N= 6)		
More contact	1	16.6
No response	5	83.3
25. How would you rate your relationship with the teacher aide?		
Excellent	9	64.2
Good	3	21.4
Poor	2	14.2
26. Why?		
Flexible	4	28.5
Responsible	7	50.0
Good in small groups	2	14.2
Good attendance	1	7.1
Bad attendance	1	7.1
Sympathetic	2	14.2
Work well together	7	50.0
Headstrong	1	7.1
27. In which areas do you feel this program is most successful?		
Comprehension	3	21.4
Motivation	1	7.1
Pronunciation	1	7.1
Audio and visual perception	5	35.7
Verbal abilities	7	50.0
Confidence	1	7.1
Teaching slow readers	1	7.1
28. In which areas do you feel this program is least successful?		
Phonics	4	28.5
Maintaining attention	1	7.1
Vocabulary	2	14.2
Retention	1	7.1
Needs more repetition	1	7.1
Independent work	2	14.2
Lack of supplies	1	7.1
Too detailed	1	7.1
Choice of stories	1	7.1
Should be started earlier	1	7.1
Structural Analysis	1	7.1
Initial consonants	1	7.1
No response	1	7.1

	# of Responses	%
29. With which of the special procedures in this program have you experienced success?		
Tach-x	10	71.4
Talking alphabet	2	14.1
Controlled reader	4	28.5
Aud-x	5	35.7
Word recognition book	1	7.1
Reading composition	1	7.1
Library books	1	7.1
Audio-visual	1	7.1
Worksheets	1	7.1
Samplers	1	7.1
Reading pamphlets	1	7.1
30. With which have you not had success?		
Controlled reader	8	57.1
Aud-x	3	21.4
"My Word Book"	2	14.1
Tach-x shadow letter	2	14.1
Varies with child	1	7.1
No response	1	7.1
31. Rate quality of instruction provided for word analysis.		
Excellent	1	7.1
Good	7	50.0
Fair	2	14.1
Poor	2	14.1
Had to be supplemented	1	7.1
Vocabulary review not good	1	7.1
I do it myself	1	7.1
32. Rate quality of instruction provided for development of skills that are verbal.		
Excellent	3	21.4
Good	5	35.7
Fair	4	28.5
Poor	1	7.1
Don't know	1	7.1
Little time to supplement	1	7.1
33. Rate quality of instruction for auditory discrimination		
Excellent	1	7.1
Good	7	50.0
Fair	1	7.1
Poor	3	21.4
Requires reinforcement	1	7.1
Needs supplements	1	7.1
Superficial	1	7.1

	# of Responses	%
34. Rate instruction for visual discrimination.	4	28.5
Excellent	8	57.1
Good	1	7.1
Fair	1	7.1
Poor	1	7.1
Inadequate	1	7.1
Needs supplements		
35. Rate progress of students in program.		
Excellent	1	7.1
Good	6	42.8
Fair	2	14.2
Poor	0	0
Not good with slow children	2	14.2
Benefitted from readiness	1	7.1
Better than other materials	1	7.1
Slow initially	1	7.1
Good with visual and auditory discrimination	1	7.1
36. How does progress of this group compare with groups without machines?		
Greater progress	6	42.8
Less progress	1	7.1
About the same	3	21.4
Cannot say	4	28.5
37. Rate behavior of this group with those without machines.		
More disciplined	2	14.2
Less disciplined	2	14.2
Greater interest	7	50.0
Same behavior	2	14.2
Good after initial setup	1	7.1
Don't know	1	7.1
38. Evaluate program overall		
Very effective	4	28.5
Effective	7	50.0
Very ineffective	1	7.1
Good for fast classes - poor for slow	1	7.1
Well organized	1	7.1
39. Why do you think this?		
Has real meaning for the children	8	57.1
Increased children's interest in reading	12	85.7
Idea good, but needs better organization	5	35.7
Needs more personnel	7	50.0
Doesn't capture children's interest	1	7.1
Geared for English speaking children	1	7.1

	# of Responses	%
Stimulate children to write	1	7.1
Structured	2	14.2
Variety of materials	4	28.5
Continual reinforcement	1	7.1
Increased independence	1	7.1
Does not require independence	1	7.1
40. How do you think the children like the program?		
Very much	9	64.2
okay	4	28.5
Some did, some didn't	1	7.1
41. Would you like to teach in this program next year?		
No response	1	7.1
Yes	12	85.7
No	1	7.1
42. Why?		
To follow progress	6	42.8
Enjoy it	3	21.4
Didn't like it	1	7.1
Try again	1	7.1
Increased independence	1	7.1
Stifles teachers	1	7.1
No response	1	7.1
43. What would you suggest to improve the program?		
More and better teacher training	9	64.2
More take home materials	3	21.4
More space	2	14.2
More phonics	1	7.1
More help in setting up	1	7.1
Advice on dividing pupils into groups	1	7.1
Try it on faster class	1	7.1
More machines	1	7.1
Geared cycle for teaching pace	1	7.1
Slow down pace	1	7.1
Increased reinforcement	1	7.1
Reevaluate certain procedures	1	7.1
More preparation for children with machines	1	7.1
Start children at same time	1	7.1
Specific curriculum for Latins	1	7.1

	# of Responses	%
A. Regular licenses in:		
Common Branches	7	50.0
Early Childhood	4	28.5
Elementary	1	7.1
No response	2	14.2
B. Substitute licenses:		
J.H.S. Social Studies	1	7.1
None	13	92.8
C. Ancillary licenses		
N.Y. S	3	21.4
Administration and Supervision	1	7.1
Physical Education and Health	1	7.1
No response	10	71.4
D. The subject I am teaching now:		
Early Childhood	1	7.1
Common Branches	2	14.2
No response	11	78.5
E. Grade level		
First	8	57.1
Second	4	28.5
Acting A P	1	7.1
No response	1	7.1
F. Years teaching experience		
1	1	7.1
2	1	7.1
3	1	7.1
4	4	28.5
5	3	21.4
6	0	0
7	1	7.1
8	0	0
9	0	0
10	1	7.1
11	0	0
12	1	7.1
No response	1	7.1
G. Race		
White	10	71.4
Black	4	28.5

DIAGNOSTIC AND REMEDIAL LEARNING LABORATORY

Educational Assistants' Responses N=14

	# of Responses	%
1. How long have you been employed as an educational assistant?		
One year or less	9	64.2
One-two years	4	28.5
Two years or more	1	7.1
2. Did you work on a reading program last year?		
Yes	3	21.4
No	5	35.7
No response	6	42.8
3. What school did you work in last year? (N= 5)		
Same school	2	40.0
Different school	1	20.0
No response	2	40.0
4. What program did you work on last year?		
Community indigenous	4	28.5
Reading and language	2	14.2
None	4	28.5
No response	4	28.5
5. How much training did you have for this job before you actually began work?		
None	7	50.0
One-two days	0	0
Three-four days	0	0
One week	2	14.2
One-two weeks	2	14.2
Two-four weeks	2	14.2
Other (no scheduled training)	1	7.1
6. Was the training given in a (N= 7)		
Large group (greater than 10)	4	57.1
Small group (less than 10)	2	28.5
Individually	1	14.2
7. Who was your teacher for the training? (N= 7)		
Reading clinician	1	14.2
Classroom teacher	2	28.5
Executive officer	1	14.2
Program director	6	85.7
8. How much training is there for you while you are working in the program?		
None	5	35.7
One hour per day	1	7.1
Two and a half hours per week	3	21.4
Three hours per week	3	21.4
More than two hours	1	7.1
Others (No scheduled training)	1	7.1

	# of Responses	%
9. Is the training given in a (N= 9)		
Large group (more than 10)	4	44.4
Small group (less than 10)	3	33.3
Individually	2	22.2
(Not applicable N=5)		
10 Who is your teacher? (N = 9)		
Classroom teacher	3	33.3
Program director	7	77.1
School aid	1	11.1
Special teachers	2	22.2
11. How many hours work do you work?		
10 or less	2	14.2
11-15	0	0
16-20	2	14.2
21-25	5	35.7
30-34	5	35.7
12. How well do you like what you are doing?		
Like very much	13	92.8
Like somewhat	0	0
Dislike somewhat	1	7.1
Frustrating	1	7.1
13. What are your duties and responsibilities?		
Work directly with children	13	92.8
Assist teachen with records	4	28.5
Assist teacher with material	6	42.8
Set up machines and materials	3	21.4
Run machines	2	14.2
Submit weekly reports	1	7.1
Teach lessons	1	7.1
14 Do you feel you are needed for what you are doing?		
Yes	13	92.8
Most of time	2	14.2
No	0	0
15. Does this work mean more to you than just a job?		
Yes	13	92.8
Most of the time	1	7.1
No	0	0
16. Why?		
Enjoy working with children	10	71.4
Experience for teaching	2	14.2
Personally rewarding	1	7.1
Increases understanding of school	1	7.1
Help own children better	1	7.1
Identification for children with working parents	1	7.1
Feel I am helping the children	1	7.1

All

	# of Responses	%
17. To whom are you responsible?		
Classroom teacher	8	57.1
Program Director	7	50.0
Reading Clinician	0	0
18. Do you know the Program Director?		
Yes	10	71.4
No	4	28.5
19. How would you rate the Program Director? (N- 10)		
Very effective	4	40
Effective	3	30
Ineffective	0	0
Don't know	3	30
20. Why? (N - 10)		
Good teacher	2	20
Cooperative	2	20
Explains duties clearly	2	20
Encouraging	1	10
Accessible	1	10
21. What is your relationship to the reading clinician?		
Work closely with him	2	14.2
Receive direction and instruction	2	14.2
Little contact with him	7	50.0
Purely personal relationship	1	7.1
No response	3	21.4
22. What is your relationship to the classroom teacher?		
Work closely with him	11	78.5
Receive direction and instruction	8	57.1
Little contact	1	7.1
23. What is your attitude toward the school in general?		
Good	7	50.0
Average	1	7.1
Poor	1	7.1
Disciplinary problem	1	7.1
Choose pupils with more care	1	7.1
Increased understanding of problems	1	7.1
No response	2	14.2
24. Has your attitude toward the school changed since you have been employed as an educational assistant?		
Yes	7	50.0
No	5	35.7
No response	2	14.2

	# of Responses	%
25. (If yes,) How has your opinion changed? (N= 7)		
More favorable	4	57.1
Less favorable	2	28.5
Increased understanding of problems faced by school	5	71.4
Increased understanding of school's lack of concern for children	4	57.1
Increased understanding of lack of relevance of present educational matter	2	28.5
Teachers very good	1	14.2
26. How would you evaluate this program?		
Very effective	8	57.1
Effective	5	35.7
Success varies with group intelligence	2	14.2
27. Why do you think answer to # 26 ?		
Has meaning for children	6	42.8
Increased interest in school work	10	71.4
Idea good, but poor organization	6	42.8
Need more personnel	1	7.1
Doesn't capture pupil's interest	1	7.1
Disorganized	2	14.2
Some groups do better than others	3	21.4
Teachers are interested in pupils	2	14.2
Children make good progress	1	7.1
Teacher could be more interested	1	7.1
28. How well do you think the pupils like the program?		
Very much	12	85.7
Okay	2	14.2
Not very much	0	0
Slow readers lose interest	1	7.1
29. Suggestions for improving program:		
Better organization	4	28.5
More training for teachers and para-professionals	6	42.8
More para-professionals employed in program	4	28.5
Better books and materials	2	14.2
No suggestion, okay as is	2	14.2
More space	1	7.1
Divided between fast and slow	1	7.1
Expanded	1	7.1
Periodic teacher-assistant meetings	1	7.1
30. Would you like to be an educational assistant in this program next year?		
Yes	13	92.8
No	1	7.1

	# of Responses	%
31. Why?		
Duties are rewarding	13	92.8
Duties different than described	2	14.2
Salary adequate	2	14.2
Salary inadequate	4	28.5
Too few hours work	1	7.1
Too many hours work	0	0
Follow through	1	7.1
Irregular wages	1	7.1
Bureaucracy	1	7.1
Conflicts	1	7.1
32. How did you hear about your job?		
Community organization meeting	3	21.4
Friend	5	35.7
Principal	3	21.4
Via another school	1	7.1
P.T.A.	2	14.2
Relative	1	7.1
33. Who actually hired you?		
Commmnity agency representative	3	21.4
Program Director	3	21.4
Principal	6	42.8
Youth in Action	2	14.2
Manpower	1	7.1
34. Do you live nearby?		
Yes	10	71.4
No	3	21.4
No response	1	7.1
35. What is highest grade you have completed in school?		
Eleventh	1	7.1
Twelfth	9	64.2
One-two years college	2	14.2
Two and a half years college	1	7.1
Still in college	1	7.1
Few months in business school	1	7.1
College graduate	1	7.1
36. What is your age bracket?		
20-29	5	35.7
30-39	6	42.8
20-49	2	14.2
50 or over	1	7.1
What public school?		
P.S. 5	3	21.4
P.S. 26	4	28.5
P.S. 81	1	7.1
P.S. 83	2	14.2
P.S. 106	1	7.1
P.S. 151	3	21.4
Race		
White	0	0
Black	14	100

DIAGNOSTIC AND REMEDIAL LEARNING LABORATORY

Parents' Responses N=52

	PS 106 res. N=12	%	5 res. N=6	%	274 res. N=6	%	81 res. N=8	%	83 res. N=3	%	26 res. N=2	%	151 res. N=15	%	Total resp. N=52	%
1. Do you think that it is important for the schools to have special classes to help the children learn to read better?																
yes	12	100	6	100	6	100	8	100	3	100	2	100	15	100	52	100
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Why do you think that it is important (unimportant)?																
-many children do not learn how to read well in the regular classes	2	16.6	3	50	6	100	5	62.5	3	100	2	100	3	20.0	24	46.1
-some children need special help to learn how to read	7	58.3	6	100	3	50	8	100	3	100	2	100	7	46.6	36	69.2
-the children should be taught how to read well in the regular classes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
-helps slow readers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20.0	3	5.7
increases understanding	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
increases learning	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	2	3.8
increases interest	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	2	3.8
-hard to teach at home	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	1	1.9
-important for Latins who need help	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
3. (If yes to #1, ask:) What kinds of things do you think should be done in these special classes?																
-children should get individual help	8	66.6	6	100	6	100	7	87.5	3	100	1	50	6	40.0	37	71.1
-better books should be used	3	25.0	4	66.6	4	66.6	4	50.0	2	66.6	2	100	4	26.6	23	44.2
-children should practice more	2	16.6	4	66.6	4	66.6	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	3	20.0	14	26.9
-special equipment should be used	0	.0	5	83.3	4	66.6	6	75.0	0	0	1	50	9	60.0	25	48.0
-smaller classes	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
-spelling and comprehension	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	33.3	6	11.5
-more teachers	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	1	6.6	3	5.7
-less machine emphasis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
-diff. bks. for fast and slow	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	2	3.8
-books to bring home	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
--phonics	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
-time and patience	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	2	3.8
4. Do you know that your child is participating in a special reading laboratory class?																
yes (go to #11)	6	50.0	4	66.6	5	83.3	5	62.5	0	0	1	50	13	86.6	34	65.3
no (cont. #5)	6	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.6	3	37.5	3	100	1	50	1	6.6	17	32.6
no response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	1	1.9

	PS 106		5		274		81		83		26		151		Total	
	resp.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%
5. Does your child ever tell you about things he does in school?	N=6		N=2		N=1		N=3		N=3		N=1		N=1		N=17	
yes, often	3	50.0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	100	0	0	6	35.2
yes, sometimes	2	33.3	1	50	0	0	2	66.6	1	33.3	0	0	1	100	7	41.1
seldom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no	1	16.6	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.8
no response	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	2	3.8
(If yes) 6. What kinds of things does he tell you?	N=5		N=2		N=1		N=3		N=2		N=1		N=1		N=15	
about his teacher	1	20	1	50	1	100	3	100	2	100	1	100	0	0	9	60.0
about his friends	3	60	0	0	1	100	1	33.3	1	50	0	0	0	0	6	40.0
about what he does	2	40	0	0	0	0	3	100	1	50	1	100	1	100	8	53.3
what happens in class	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	6.6
likes machines	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no response	1	20	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13.3
7. Have you met your child's teacher?																
yes	6	100	1	50	1	100	3	100	2	66.6	1	100	1	100	15	88.2
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no response	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	2	11.7
8. Have you been visited by a family assistant?																
yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	5.8
no	6	100	1	50	1	100	3	100	1	33.3	1	100	1	100	14	82.3
no response	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	2	11.7
9. If your child had a reading problem, would you contact someone at the school for help?																
yes	4	66.6	1	50	1	100	2	66.6	1	33.3	1	100	0	0	10	58.8
maybe	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	2	11.7
no	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.6	0	0	0	0	4	23.5
no response	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.8
(If yes or Maybe) 10. Who would you contact?	N=5		N=2		N=1		N=2		N=1		N=1		N=1		N=13	
principal	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	2	15.3
teacher	5	100	1	50	1	100	2	100	1	100	1	100	0	0	11	84.6
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	7.6
no response	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7.6

	PS 106 resp.	%	5 res.	%	274 res.	%	81 res.	%	83 res.	%	26 res.	%	151 res.	%	Total res.	%
11. Is this the first year that your child has been in the special reading laboratory?																
yes	10	83.3	5	83.3	6	100	6	75.0	3	100	1	50	14	93.3	45	86.5
no	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	1	50	0	0	3	5.7
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
no response	2	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	3	5.7
12. (If no, ask:) Do you think that these classes have helped your child to read better?	N=0		N=1		N=0		N=1		N=0		N=1		N=0		N=3	
yes, very much	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	66.6
yes, some	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	33.3
13. Does your child ever tell you about these classes?																
yes	9	75.0	5	83.3	6	100	8	100	2	66.6	2	100	14	93.3	46	88.4
no	1	8.3	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	3	5.7
no response	2	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	3	5.7
14. (If yes, ask:) What kinds of things does he tell you about these classes?	N=9		N=5		N=6		N=8		N=2		N=2		N=14		N=46	
about his teacher	3	33.3	3	60	4	66.6	7	87.5	1	50	0	0	5	33.3	23	50.0
about the equipment he uses	3	33.3	4	80	5	83.3	6	75.0	1	50	1	50	12	80	32	69.5
about the books and materials he uses	4	44.4	2	40	4	66.6	5	62.5	2	100	0	0	10	66.6	27	58.6
about the things he does	4	44.4	3	60	4	66.6	3	37.5	1	50	0	0	9	60	24	52.1
new words	1	11.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	2	4.3
techniques	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	2	13.3	3	6.5
15. Has your child ever brought home any books or things that he has made in these classes?																
yes	10	83.3	6	100	6	100	8	100	3	100	1	50	13	86.6	47	90.3
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	1	1.9
no response	2	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	6.6	4	7.6

	PS106		5		274		81		83		26		151		Total	
	resp.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%
16. How do you think he feels about these classes?																
likes them very much	9	75.0	5	83.3	6	100	7	87.5	3	100	1	50	14	93.3	45	86.5
seems to like them better than other classes	1	8.3	1	16.6	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.7
doesn't like them	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
learned a lot	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
increased confidence	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
no response	2	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	6.6	4	7.6
17. Have you been visited by a family assistant?																
yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
no	10	83.3	6	100	5	83.3	8	100	2	66.6	1	50	13	86.6	45	86.5
no response	2	16.6	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	1	50	2	13.3	6	11.5
18. Have you met your child's teacher?																
yes	8	66.6	6	100	4	66.6	8	100	3	100	1	50	13	86.6	43	82.6
no	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
no response	3	25.0	0	0	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	50	2	13.3	8	15.3
19. If your child had a reading problem, would you contact someone at school for help?																
yes	9	75.0	6	100	5	83.3	6	75.0	3	100	1	50	13	86.6	43	82.6
maybe	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	25.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.8
no response	2	16.6	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	1	50	2	13.3	6	11.5
20. (If yes or maybe, ask:) Who would you contact at the school?	N=10		N=6		N=5		N=6		N=3		N=1		N=13		N=44	
principal	0	0	3	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	4	9.0
a teacher	10	100	6	100	5	100	6	100	2	66.6	1	100	10	66.6	40	90.9
guidance counselor	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.2
coordinator	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	3	6.8
reading clinician	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	2	13.3	3	6.8

	PS 106		5		274		81		83		26		151		Total	
	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%
(If no to # 19) 21. Why wouldn't you discuss your child's problem with anyone in the school?	N=0		N=0		N=0		N=2		N=0		N=0		N=0			
don't know anyone in the school	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
language difficulty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
distance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
help him myself	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
consult w/teacher and then if referred	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
don't think they would help	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no response	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
22. Do you know the program director?																
yes	1	8.3	1	16.6	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	6.6	5	9.6
no	9	75.0	5	83.3	5	83.3	8	100	3	100	1	50	13	86.6	44	84.6
no response	2	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	3	5.7
23. (If yes, ask:) How would you rate him?	N=1		N=1		N=1		N=0		N=0		N=1		N=1		N=5	
very effective	1	100	1	100	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	4	80.0
effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	20.0
ineffective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Why?	N=1		N=1		N=1		N=0		N=0		N=1		N=1		N=5	
patient	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	2	40.0
good teacher	1	100	1	100	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	60.0
good relations w/children	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	100	3	60.0
25. What would you suggest to improve the program?																
better organization	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	1	50	0	0	3	5.7
more training for teachers and para-prof.	0	0	2	33.3	2	33.3	1	12.5	0	0	1	50	1	6.6	7	13.4
more para-professionals in program	0	0	2	33.3	2	33.3	1	12.5	0	0	1	50	0	0	6	11.6
better books and materials	0	0	3	50	1	16.6	3	37.5	0	0	1	50	1	6.6	9	17.3
no suggestion, o.k. as is	9	75.0	3	50	3	50	2	25.0	1	33.3	0	0	7	46.6	25	48.0
more widespread	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	3	20.0	4	7.6
smaller classes	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	25.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.8
more teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7.0	0	0	1	50	0	0	2	3.8
parent involvement	0	0	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.8

	PS 106		5		274		81		83		26		151		Total	
	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%	res.	%
25. (cont.)																
-teacher training for emotionally disturbed children	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
-teach foreign language to teachers and children	0	0	0	0	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
-add black culture books	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
-faster machine installation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	1	1.9
-time to read by self	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9
-don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	25.0	2	66.6	1	50	5	33.3	10	19.2
-no response	2	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.8
Sex of child																
female	8	66.6	3	50	1	16.6	4	50	1	33.3	2	100	11	73.3	30	57.6
male	4	33.3	3	50	5	83.3	4	50	2	66.6	0	0	4	26.6	22	42.3
Race of Parent																
White	1	8.3	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	1	6.6	3	5.7
Black	7	58.3	5	83.3	1	16.6	1	12.5	1	33.3	2	100	12	80.0	29	55.7
Puerto Rican	4	33.3	1	16.6	5	83.3	6	75.0	2	66.6	0	0	2	13.3	20	38.4

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

Parents' Responses N=48

	P.S. 154		P.S. 57		P.S. 80		P.S. 161		P.S. 155		Totals	
	N=6		N=4		N=10		N = 23		N=5		N=48	
1. Do you think it is important for schools to teach African culture, Afro-American heritage, and Antillean culture classes?												
Yes	6	100	4	100	10	100	20	86.9	5	100	45	93.7
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	13.0	0	0	3	6.2
No response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Why do you think so?												
To teach kids that their ancestors have made important contributions to our culture	0	0	4	100	5	50	2	8.6	3	60	14	29.1
To help children feel they are an important part of our society	0	0	2	50	5	50	1	4.3	0	0	8	16.6
Present an accurate picture of history and growth of our society	0	0	1	25	2	20	8	34.7	2	40	13	27.0
Program not necessary	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	1	2.0
Same as others, people work, same culture	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	1	2.0
Kids should concentrate on academic studies	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	2.0
Learn about black race	5	83.3	3	75	1	10	3	13.0	1	20	13	27.0
Instill pride	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	3	6.2
Learn about all people	1	16.6	0	0	2	20	6	26.0	0	0	9	18.7
Don't know	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	4	17.3	0	0	5	10.4
Africa not of interest to kids	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	1	2.0
No response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. What kinds of things do you think should be taught in these classes?												
History	3	50	1	25	5	50	10	43.4	2	40	21	43.7
Geography	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	2.0
About famous people	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	4.3	0	0	2	4.1
How different people live	0	0	0	0	3	30	2	8.6	1	20	6	12.5
Negro contribution to culture	4	66.6	4	100	1	10	4	17.3	3	60	16	33.3
African culture	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	2	4.1
Everything	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.0
What benefits child	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	1	2.0
Don't know	1	16.6	0	0	4	40	8	34.7	1	20	14	29.1
No response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Do you know your child is attending cultural heritage classes?												
Yes (If yes-go to 8)	6	100	4	100	4	40	11	47.8	1	20	26	54.1
No (If no-go to 5) And stop at #7	0	0	0	0	6	60	12	52.1	4	80	22	45.8
No response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	P.S. 154			P.S. 57			P.S. 80			P.S. 161			P.S. 155			Totals		
	N	R	%	N	R	%	N	R	%	N	R	%	N	R	%	N	R	%
5. Does your child tell you about things he does in school?																		
Yes, often	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	66.6	12	5	41.6	4	2	50	22	11	50.0
Yes, sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0		1	16.6		7	58.3		2	50		10	45.4
Seldom		0	0		0	0		1	16.6		0	0		0	0		1	4.5
No		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
No response		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
6. What kinds of things does he tell you?																		
About his teacher		0	0		0	0		1	16.6		0	0		0	0		1	4.5
About his friends		0	0		0	0		1	16.6		0	0		0	0		1	4.5
About what he does		0	0		0	0		6	100		10	83.3		3	75		19	86.3
Special performances		0	0		0	0		1	16.6		0	0		1	25		2	9.0
Speakers		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
What he makes		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
Trips		0	0		0	0		0	0		2	16.6		0	0		2	9.0
How he feels		0	0		0	0		0	0		1	8.3		0	0		1	4.5
No response		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		1	25		1	4.5
7. Have you met your child's teacher?																		
Yes		0	0		0	0		5	83.3		8	66.6		4	100		17	77.2
No		0	0		0	0		1	16.6		2	16.6		0	0		3	13.6
No response		0	0		0	0		0	0		2	16.6		0	0		2	9.0
8. Is this the first time that your child has been in the CHIP classes?																		
Yes	6	5	83.3	4	4	100	4	3	75	11	7	63.6	1	0	0		19	67.8
No		1	16.6		0	0		1	25		3	27.2		0	0		5	17.8
No response		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
Don't know		0	0		0	0		0	0		1	9.0		1	100		2	7.1
9. (If no) Did he have the same teacher last year as this year?																		
Yes	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
No		0	100		0	0		1	100		3	100		0	0		5	100
10. Does your child ever tell you about these classes																		
Yes	6	5	83.3	4	4	100	4	4	100	11	8	72.7	1	0	0		21	80.7
No		1	16.6		0	0		0	0		3	27.2		1	100		5	19.2
No response		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0

	P.S. 154		P.S. 57		P.S. 80		P.S.161		P.S. 155		Totals	
(If yes, ask):	N=5		N=4		N=4		N=8		N=0		N=21	
11. What kinds of things does he tell you?												
About his teacher	3	60	2	50	1	25	0	0	0	0	6	28.5
About the books and materials he uses	1	20	0	0	1	25	2	25.0	0	0	4	19.0
About the things he learns	4	80	2	50	3	75	4	50.0	0	0	13	61.9
Things he makes	2	40	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0	6	28.5
Special presentations	2	40	4	100	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	7	33.3
Speakers	1	20	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9.5
Trips	0	0	1	25	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	2	9.5
Art and music	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	25,0	0	0	2	9.5
No response	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	1	4.7
12. (If yes to #10 ask) How does he feel about these classes?												
Likes them very much	4	80	4	100	2	50	3	37.5	0	0	13	61.9
Seems to like them better than other classes	0	0	1	25	2	50	3	37.5	0	0	6	28.5
Indifferent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	1	4.7
Doesn't like them very much	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	2	9.5
13. Has your child brought home books or things he has made in these classes?	N=6		N=4		N=4		N=11		N=1		N=26	
Yes	4	66.6	4	100	3	75	6	54.5	0	0	17	65.3
No	2	33.3	0	0	1	25	5	45.4	1	100	9	34.6
14. Have you ever been asked to make things or help in any way in these classes?												
Yes	0	0	0	0	1	25	2	18.1	0	0	3	11.5
No	6	100	4	100	3	75	9	81.8	1	100	23	88.4
					N=1		N=3					
15. (If yes, ask) How?												
No response	N.A.		N.A.		1	100	0	0	N.A.		1	33.3
Go on tripswith them					0	0	2	100			2	66.6
Play songs					0	0	1	50			1	33.3
16. Do you know your child attends special theatrical presentations concerning cultural heritage?	N=6											
Yes	5	83.3	4	100	4	100	10	90.9	0	0	23	88.4
No	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	1	9.0	1	100	3	11.5

	P. 15		P. 57		P.S. 30		P.S.161		I.S. 1[illegible]		Totals	
(If Yes)												
17. Does your child ever tell you about these presentations?	N=5		N=4		N=4		N=10		N=0		N=23	
Yes	5	100	4	100	4	100	10	100	0	0	23	100
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. (If Yes) How do you think he feels about them?												
Likes them very much	4	80	3	75	3	75	70	70	0	0	17	73.9
Seems to like them better than other special assemblies	2	40	2	25	1	25	2	20	0	0	7	30.4
Indifferent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Doesn't like them much	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	1	4.3
19. Do you know the CHIP director?												
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	18.1	0	0	2	7.6
No	6	100	4	100	3	75	9	81.8	1	100	23	88.4
No response	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	1	3.8
20. (If yes) How would you rate him?	N=0		N=0		N=0		N=2		N=0		N=2	
Very effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	2	100
Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barely effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ineffective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very ineffective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Why?												
Good person	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50
Works for the children's sake	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50
22. What should be qualifications for a CHIP teacher?												
Black	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	9.0	0	0	3	11.5
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rican (or Spanish speaking)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Experienced, licensed teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	18.1	0	0	2	7.6
Expert, not necessarily experienced, licensed teachers	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.8
No special qualifications	1	16.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.8
Well qualified person	3	50	3	75	2	50	1	9.0	0	0	9	34.6
Don't know	0	0	0	0	1	25	7	63.6	1	100	9	34.6
No response	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	1	3.8
Interest in children	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.0	0	0	1	3.8

	P.S. 154		P.S. 57		P.S. 80		P.S.161		P.S.155		Totals	
23. Suggestions to improve program												
Better organization	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
More training for teachers and and para-professionals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Better books and materials	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No suggestion, o.k. as is	3	50	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	3	50	1	20	0	0	2	18.1	0	0	7	26.9
No response	0	0	0	0	3	75	6	54.5	1	100	14	53.8
More parent involvement	0	0	1	20	1	25	0	0	0	0	1	3.8
Cultural program for parents	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.8
Dancing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.8
More current problems	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.0	0	0	1	3.8
More para-professionals in program	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.0	0	0	1	3.8
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.0	0	0	1	3.8
Race	N=6		N=4		N=10		N=23		N=5		N 48	
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black	6	100	4	100	6	60	16	69.5	4	80	36	75.0
Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	4	40	7	30.4	1	20	12	25.0
Sex of Child												
Female	3	50	2	50	5	50	11	47.8	1	20	22	45.8
Male	3	50	2	50	4	40	11	47.8	4	80	24	50.0
No response	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	4.3	0	0	2	4.1

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

Classroom Teachers' Responses N=18

District 4 - Manhattan	Comm. Shea	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	P.S. 57	P.S. 154 + Annex	P.S. 80	Totals	%
1. Is this the first year your classes participated in CHIP?								
yes	3	1	3	1	4	1	13	72
no	0	1	2	1	0	1	5	28
2. If no, do you think that the program has changed? (N=5)								
yes	0	0	2	1	0	1	4	80
no response	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	20
3. If yes, how do you think it has changed? (multiple response)								
better organized	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	20
better curriculum	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	20
children more responsive	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	20
new teachers	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	60
less organized	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	60
no clear curriculum	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	20
children less responsive	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	20
other								
more classroom oriented	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	20
no response	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	20
4. How would you rate CHIP overall?								
excellent	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	17
good	1	2	2	1	2	0	8	44
fair	0	0	3	0	1	2	6	33
poor	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6
5. Why? (multiple response)								
new exposure	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	17
enjoyable for children	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	17
poor organization	0	2	5	0	4	2	13	72
no response	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6
6. How would you rate children's response to CHIP theatrical presentations?								
very enthusiastic	2	1	0	2	1	1	7	39
enthusiastic	1	1	3	0	1	1	7	39
fair	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6
not interested	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
don't know	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	17
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Comm. Shea	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	P.S. 57	P.S. 154+ Annex	P.S. 80	Total	%
7. (If enthusiastic or very enthusiastic, ask:) Do you think this enthusiasm is carried over into CHIP class sessions?								N=14
yes	2	1	0	1	1	0	5	36
no	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	14
sometimes	0	1	3	1	1	1	7	50
8. How would you rate children's responses to CHIP classes as compared to regular academic classes?								
more responsive	1	1	0	1	1	1	5	28
about the same	1	0	2	0	2	1	6	33
less responsive	1	1	3	0	1	0	6	33
no opinion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
varies	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	6
9. Have you been able to incorporate any of the material presented to the children by CHIP into other classes?								
yes	1	0	3	1	2	0	7	39
no	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	11
sometimes	2	2	2	1	1	1	9	50
10. If yes, or sometimes: How have you been able to incorporate the material? (multiple response)								N=16
compositions	0	0	2	2	3	0	7	44
class discussions	3	2	4	2	2	0	13	81
debates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
reading	1	2	3	0	1	1	8	50
library research	0	2	4	1	1	0	8	50
other	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	13
art, poetry, dance, music	0	0	3	1	3	0	7	44
social studies	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	13
11. Did you have any orientation or planning sessions prior to participation in CHIP?								
yes	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	17
no	2	1	5	2	4	1	15	83
12. If yes, how many?								N=3
one-two days	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	100
three-four days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
five days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
more than five days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. If yes to #11; what kind of Orientation or planning sessions did you have?								N=3
individual (with CHIP teacher)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
small group	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	33

	Comm. Shea	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	P.S. 57	P.S. 154+ Annex	P.S. 80	Total	%
large group (class)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	33
individual (with program director)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
small group (w/other teachers)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	33
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Have you attended any planning sessions since the program has been in operation?								
yes	1	1	0	1	0	1	4	22
no	2	1	5	1	4	1	14	78
15. If yes; How many?								N=4
one	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	75
two	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	25
three	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
more than three	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Do you have a CHIP para.-prof. assigned to your class?								
yes	0	2	4	2	2	2	12	67
no	2	0	1	0	2	0	5	28
no response	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
17. (If yes) What are his duties and responsibilities?		(multiple response)						N=12
works directly with children	0	2	4	1	0	1	8	67
assists teacher with paper work	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	8
assists teachers with collection of material and lesson planning		1	1	1	1	1	5	42
none of the above	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	8
other								
no response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. To whom is the para-professional responsible?								N=12
CHIP teacher	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	33
classroom teacher	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	17
don't know	0	0	2	0	2	1	5	42
other	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8
no response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. What is your relationship to the CHIP teacher?								
work closely with him	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	11
receive material and suggestions	1	2	4	1	2	0	10	56
have very little contact with him	1	0	1	0	2	2	6	33
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Comm. Shea	P.S. 155	161	57	154 Annex	80	Total	%
20. Do you know the program director?								
yes, well	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6
yes, slightly	2	1	4	2	2	1	12	67
no	1	1	1	0	2	0	5	28
21. How would you rate the program director?								
very effective	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	11
effective	0	2	2	2	1	2	9	50
barely effective	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	11
ineffective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
very ineffective	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6
no response	1	0	2	0	1	0	4	22
22. Why?								
lack of communication	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.5
poor coordination	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	16.6
interested in students, good ideas	0	0	1	1	2	1	5	27.7
no response	2	1	3	1	1	1	9	50.0
23. What do you think should be qualifications of teachers of CHIP classes?								
Black	2	1	1	0	3	0	7	39
White	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	6
Puerto Rican(or Spanish speaking)	2	1	1	0	0	0	4	22
experienced	2	0	3	0	0	0	5	28
expert in field, not necessarily experienced teacher	2	2	1	2	4	1	12	67
other								
any good licensed teacher	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	6
dynamic, capable of relating and teaching	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	28
24. What would you suggest to improve the program?								
expand program	0	0	0	2	2	0	4	22
hire more experienced teachers	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	17
develop better curriculum	1	3	4	0	2	0	10	55.5
have more planning sessions	1	1	3	2	2	0	9	50
obtain more and better material	1	1	3	2	1	1	9	50
have better organization	3	2	4	0	1	2	12	67
hire more para-professionals	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	17
no suggestions, o.k. as is	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
dynamic, creative personality	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6
25. How was your class selected to participate in CHIP?								
volunteered	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	11
requested by principal	3	2	5	1	0	2	13	72
requested by program director	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
requested by Title I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other								
by lot	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	17
don't know	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6

	Comm. Shea	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	P.S. 57	P.S. 154+ Annex	P.S. 80	Total	%
26. Would you like your class to participate in CHIP next year if possible?								
yes	3	2	4	2	3	2	16	89
no	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	11
27. Why or why not?								
only if better organized, coordinated	1	2	3	0	1	0	7	39
no response	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	22
teacher learns as student learns	0	0	1	2	3	0	6	33
miscellaneous	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	6
28. Sex of person interviewed								
male	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	28
female	2	2	5	2	2	0	13	72
29. Age of person interviewed								
more than 21	3	2	5	2	4	2	18	100
30. Licenses held								
regular	1	2	4	2	3	2	14	78
substitute	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	11
ancillary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no response	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	11
31. Grade level								
one-three	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	11
four	1	0	2	1	1	0	5	28
five	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	17
six	1	2	0	0	1	2	6	33
no response	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	11
32. Number of years teaching experience								
one-ten	2	2	3	2	4	2	15	83
ten-twenty	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	11
no response	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	6

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

Teacher Aides' Responses N=10

	P.S. 154	P.S. 57	P.S. 80	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	Total	%
1. How long have you been employed as a teacher aide?							
one year or less	2	2	1	0	1	6	60
one-two years	0	0	1	1	1	3	30
two or more years (specify)	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
2. If more than one year; did you work on the CHIP program last year?							
yes	0	0	1	2	1	4	100
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. If no, what school did you work in last year?							
same school	0	0	1	2	1	4	100
different school	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. What program did you work in last year?							
CHIP	0	0	1	2	1	4	100
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. How much training did you have for this job before you actually began work?							
none	1	2	2	1	1	7	70
one-two days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
three-four days	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
one week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
more than 1 week	0	0	0	0	1	1	10
no response	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
6. Was the training given in a							
large group (more than 10 people)	0	0	0	1	1	2	100
small group (less than 10 people)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
individually	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Who was your teacher for the training? (multiple response)							
CHIP teacher	0	0	0	1	1	2	100
classroom teacher	0	0	0	0	1	1	50
other school personnel	0	0	0	1	1	2	100
a college or university	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
an anti-poverty agency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. How much training is there for you while you are working in the program?							
none	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
one hr. per day	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
one hr. per week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	154	57	80	155	161	Total	%
8. (cont.)							
two hrs. per week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
more than two hrs. per week	2	2	2	1	2	9	90
9. Is the training given in a							
large group (more than 10 people)	2	1	2	1	1	7	78
small group (less than 10 people)	0	1	0	0	1	2	22
individually	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Who is your teacher? (multiple response)							
CHIP teacher	2	2	2	1	2	9	100
classroom teacher	0	1	1	1	2	5	56
other school personnel	0	0	1	1	2	4	44
a college or university	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
an anti-poverty program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. How many hours a week do you work?							
10 or less	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16-20	2	2	2	2	2	10	100
more than 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. How well do you like what your are doing?							
like very much	1	2	2	1	2	8	80
like somewhat	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
dislike somewhat	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
dislike greatly	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. What are your duties and responsibilities? (multiple response)							
work directly with children	2	2	2	2	2	10	100
assist the teacher with records and paper work	2	2	1	1	2	8	80
assist teacher with collection of material and planning lessons	1	2	2	1	2	8	80
14. Do you feel that you are needed for what you are doing?							
yes	2	2	2	2	2	10	100
most of the time	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
seldom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	P.S. 154	P.S. 57	P.S. 80	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	Total	%
15. Does this work mean more to you than just a job?							
yes	2	2	2	1	2	9	90
most of the time	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
not really	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Why? (multiple response)							
no response	0	0	1	0	0	1	10
like to work with children	0	1	0	2	2	5	50
CHIP is important to children	1	0	1	0	1	3	30
feel needed	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
frees teacher for other things	0	1	0	0	0	1	10
17. To whom are you responsible?	(multiple response)						
CHIP teacher	2	2	2	2	2	10	100
classroom teacher	2	2	2	1	2	9	90
Program director	2	2	2	1	2	9	90
don't know							
other (principal)	0	0	1	1	1	3	30
18. Do you know the program director?							
yes	0	1	2	2	2	7	70
no	2	1	0	0	0	3	30
19. (If yes), how would you rate the program director?							
very effective	0	2	2	2	2	8	80
effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
barely effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ineffective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
very ineffective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other-no response	2	0	0	0	0	2	20
20. Why?							
interested in children-dedicated	0	1	0	0	1	2	20
works well with children and teachers	0	0	1	1	1	3	30
dynamic personality-gets good program	0	0	1	0	0	1	10
no response	2		1	1		4	40
21. What is your relationship to the CHIP teacher?		(multiple response)					
work closely with him	0	1	2	2	2	7	70
receive instruction from him	0	1	2	2	2	7	70
have very little contact with him	2	0	0	0	0	2	20

	P.S. 154	P.S. 57	P.S. 80	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	Total	%
22. What is your relationship with the classroom teacher?	(multiple response)						
work closely with him	2	2	2	2	2	10	100
receive direction and instruction from him	0	0	1	2	1	4	40
have very little contact with him	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23. What is your attitude toward the school in general?							
positive	2	2	1	2	2	9	90
negative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
mixed-it's disorganized	0	0	1	0	0	1	10
24. Has your attitude toward the school changed since you have been employed as a teacher's aide?							
yes	0	2	2	1	1	6	60
no	2	0	0	1	1	4	40
somewhat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. If yes, how has your opinion changed?							
more favorable	0	2	0	0	1	3	50
less favorable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
more understanding of the problems faced by school	0	0	2	1	1	4	67
more understanding of the lack of concern on the part of the school for the needs and interests of the children	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
more understanding of the lack of relevance of the present educational matter for children	0	0	1	0	1	2	33
26. How would you rate the overall program?							
excellent	0	2	2	1	1	6	60
good	1	0	0	1	1	3	30
fair	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no opinion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other-not needed	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
27. Why do you think that the program is very effective?							
has real meaning for the children	1	1	2	2	2	8	80
stimulates the children's interest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
in reading and other schoolwork	0	1	2	0	2	5	50

	P.S. 154	P.S. 57	P.S. 80	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	Total	%
27. (cont.)							
fair							
the idea of the program is good, but it needs better organization	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
the program needs more personnel	0	1	1	1	1	4	40
the program needs more para-prof.	0	1	1	1	0	3	30
the program does not capture the interest of the children	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
poor							
the program is disorganized	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
the program is not operative in our school	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
28. How well do you think the children like the program?							
very much	0	2	2	2	2	8	80
o.k.	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
not very much	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
no opinion, don't know	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
29. What would you suggest to improve the program	(multiple response)						
better organization	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
more training for teachers and para-prof. employed in the program		1	2	1	2	6	60
better books and materials	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
no suggestion, o.k. as is	0	1	0	1	0	2	20
other-orientation program	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
more para-prof. employed in program	0	0	1	1	2	4	40
30. What do you think should be the qualifications of a CHIP teacher?	(multiple response)						
Black	0	0	2	1	0	3	30
White	0	0	1	0	0	1	10
Puerto Rican (or Spanish speaking)	0	0	2	1	0	3	30
experienced, licensed teacher	0	0	1	0	2	3	30
expert in field, not necessarily experienced, licensed teacher	1	2	1	2	0	6	60
other-able to teach and motivate children	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
no response	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
31. Would you like to be a teacher's aide next year?							
yes	1	2	2	1	2	8	80
no	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
not sure	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
32. Why?	(multiple response)						
duties are rewarding	1	2	2	1	2	8	80

	P.S. 154	P.S. 57	P.S. 80	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	Total	%
32. (cont.)							
duties that are performed are not the same as those that were described when job was accepted	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
salary adequate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
salary inadequate	1	0	1	1	2	5	50
number of hrs./wk too few	1	0	1	0	0	2	20
number of hrs./wk too many	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
personality conflict	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
lack of clear direction from teacher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
have not been working long enough to decide	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
33. How did you hear about your job?							
a community organization meeting							
a newsletter from the school	0	0	1	0	1	2	20
a poster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
my child's teacher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
a friend	0	1	0	1	1	3	30
other							
school secretary	0	0	1	0	0	1	10
a nun	0	1	0	0	0	1	10
came in to school on my own	2	0	0	1	0	3	30
34. Who actually hired you?	(multiple response)						
a community agency representative	0	0	0	0	1	1	10
Title I Coordinator	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Program director	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Principal	1	2	1	2	2	8	80
other							
school secretary	0	0	1	0	0	1	10
Parents' Association	1	0	0	0	0	1	10
35. What is the highest grade that you have completed in school?							
elementary	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
9th grade	0	0	0	0	1	1	10
10th grade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11th grade	1	0	1	1	0	3	30
12th grade	1	2	1	0	0	4	40
1-2 yrs. college	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other-6 mo. college	0	0	0	0	1	1	10
36. Do you live nearby?							
yes	1	2	2	2	2	9	90
no	1	0	0	0	0	1	10

	P.S. 154	P.S. 57	P.S. 80	P.S. 155	P.S. 161	Total	%
37. What is your age bracket?							
less than 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-29	1	1	2	1	1	6	60
30-39	1	0	0	0	1	2	20
40-49	0	1	0	1	0	2	20
50 or over	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
38. What is your sex?							
female	2	2	2	2	2	10	100
male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
39. What is your race?							
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black	2	0	2	1	1	6	60
Puerto Rican (or Spanish speaking)	0	2	0	1	1	4	40

MOTIVATION FOR LEARNING PROGRAM

Classroom Teachers' Responses N=20

	P.S. 92	P.S. 175	Total	%
1. Is this the first experience you have had in using a rating scale?				
yes	6	6	12	60.0
no	6	2	8	40.0
2. Did you have any orientation or planning before using the scale?				
yes	5	4	9	45.0
no	7	4	11	55.0
3. (If yes, ask:) How much? (N=9)				
less than one day	3	0	3	33.3
1-2 days	2	4	6	66.7
4. What kind of orientation or planning sessions did you have?				
individual with guidance counselor	5	4	9	100
small groups	0	0	0	0
5. Do you think that they were adequate to enable you to rate the children appropriately?				
yes	3	4	7	77.8
partially	2	0	2	22.2
6. Do you think that you have adequate knowledge to rate the children appropriately without having any orientation or planning sessions prior to using the rating scale? (N=20)				
yes	8	6	14	70.0
no	2	1	3	15.0
partially	2	1	3	15.0
7. Have you attended any planning sessions since you have rated the children (i.e., since children are in program)				
yes	3	4	7	35.0
no	9	4	13	65.0
8. (If yes, ask:) How many? (N=7)				
one	0	2	2	28.58
two	1	1	2	28.58
five or six	1	1	2	28.58
over 10	1	0	1	14.28

	92	175	Total	%
9. Do you think that these sessions have helped you to better identify children who need help? (N=7)				
yes	1	1	2	28.58
no	1	3	4	57.12
other	1	0	1	14.28
10. Why?				
a. program started late; had already identified children who needed help	0	1	1	14.28
b. only discussed children already in program	2	1	3	42.85
c. was a guidance counselor for years myself so know what to look for	0	1	1	14.28
d. did not know what to look for prior to sessions	1	1	2	28.58
11. Do you know the guidance counselor?				
yes (N=20)	12	7	19	95.6
no	0	1	1	4.3
12. (If yes, ask:) How would you rate the guidance counselor? (N=19)				
very effective	6	3	9	47.77
effective	3	0	3	15.78
barely effective	2	0	2	10.52
no opinion	1	4	5	26.31
13. Why? *				
a. good perception of children's problems and relationship to teacher	1	1	2	10.52
b. children in program have improved	3	0	3	15.78
c. has helped me (teacher) in understanding children's problems	3	0	3	15.78
d. has established good relationship with children	2	1	3	15.78
e. shows concern for children	2	0	2	10.52
f. well-informed, knows what she is doing	2	0	2	10.52
g. interested and follows through	2	0	2	10.52
h. is able to function under difficult circumstances	1	0	1	5.26
i. is fulfilling functions adequately	1	0	1	5.26
j. evaluation not based on g.c. ability but on situation in which she works	1	0	1	5.26
k. never worked with g.c. before so have no basis for comparison	0	1	1	5.26

* multiple response

	92	175	Total	%
13. (cont.)				
l. seems to be dynamic and efficient	1	0	1	5.26
m. don't know her well enough to rate	0	3	3	15.78
n. did not follow up on child recommended for program	1	0	1	5.26
14. What is your relationship with the guidance counselor? (N=10)				
a. work closely with her	5	2	7	36.33
b. receive material and suggestions	2	0	2	10.50
c. exchange information regarding children and program	1	1	2	10.50
d. time together limited, but results adequate	0	1	1	5.25
e. have very little contact	4	3	7	36.33
15. How would you rate the program overall? (N=20)				
excellent	3	0	3	15.0
good	1	2	3	15.0
fair	2	0	2	10.0
poor	1	0	1	5.0
no opinion	5	6	11	55.0
16. Why?				
a. has helped the children	1	1	2	10.0
b. guidance counselro "makes" the program; don't know how it would work with anybody else	1	0	1	5.0
c. is a good thing if it can help children at an early age	1	1	2	10.0
d. could be more effective if could spend more time with children	1	0	1	5.0
e. program is too new to rate	5	4	9	45.0
f. don't know enough about the program to rate it	0	2	2	10.0
g. has had no obvious effect on children	1	0	1	5.0
h. no response	1	0	1	5.0
i. does not deal withchildren in depth	1	0	1	5.0
17. What would you suggest to improve the program? *				
a. expand the program	3	1	4	20.0
b. hire more para-professionals	0	1	1	5.0
c. more training for para-professionals	0	0	0	0
d. more communication between counselor and teacher regarding program	3	4	7	35.0
e. better organization	1	0	1	5.0
f. counselor should be full-time in one school	1	0	1	5.0

* multiple response

	92	175	Total	%
17. (cont.)				
g. make more home visits	1	0	1	5.0
h. start earlier in year	0	3	3	15.0
i. more and better material	1	0	1	5.0
j. train teachers to identify learning blocks	1	0	1	5.0
k. program too new to make suggestions	2	2	4	20.0
l. no suggestions; don't think programs such as these are of value	1	0	1	5.0
m. don't know	1	1	2	10.0
18. Would you like to have the program available to your class next year?				
yes	11	7	18	90.0
no	1	1	2	10.0
19. Why?				
a. has been of tremendous help to my children	1	0	1	5.0
b. is a new approach to individualized guidance	1	0	1	5.0
c. is important for some children to get individual help	1	4	5	25.0
d. offers the children a type of security	1	0	1	5.0
e. program helps children in earlier grades before they get into trouble in later grades	3	1	4	20.0
f. identifies and works with children who have problems other than discipline problems	1	0	1	5.0
g. need a program for aggressive children	1	0	1	5.0
h. offers some help and some is better than none	1	0	1	5.0
i. program will benefit the children if it provides them with additional books and materials	0	1	1	5.0
j. children should be carried over in the program from one year to next	1	0	1	5.0
k. don't know what the program is so can't say if I want it or not	0	1	1	5.0
* New York City Licenses (N=20)				
Regular				
Elementary-Common Branches	3	0	3	15.0
Early Childhood	4	0	4	20.0
Substitute				
Common Branches	3	4	7	35.0
Regular	1	2	3	15.0
K-2	0	1	1	5.0
Conditional	0	2	2	10.0

* multiple responses

		92	175	Total	%
Grade Levels	1	4	4	8	
	2	3	1	4	
	3	4	5	9	
	5	1	1	2	
Ethnic Background					
White		10	5	15	
Black		2	3	5	

MOTIVATION FOR LEARNING PROGRAM

Parents' Responses N=14

	P.S. 92	P.S. 175	Total #	Total %
1. Do you think that it is important for the schools to have a guidance program for the students? N=14				
A. Yes	8	5	13	92.9
B. No	0	0	0	0
C. Don't know	1	0	1	7.1
2. Why do you think that it is important/ unimportant? N=13				
A. To help the children adjust to the school environment	4	5	9	69.2
B. To help the children "do better" in their school work	3	4	7	53.8
C. Children need a little more attention than they get from the teacher	1	0	1	7.7
D. Children sometimes have problems that a more objective person than their parents can help them with	1	0	1	7.7
E. Any school program that tries to help the children is good	0	1	1	7.7
∅ Multiple responses				
3. Do you know that your child is attending guidance sessions? N=14				
A. Yes (If yes, go to #10)	5	3	8	57.1
B. No	4	1	5	35.7
C. No sure	0	1	1	7.1
4. (If no or not sure, ask) Does your child tell you about the things that he (she) does in school? N=6				
A. Yes, often	1	1	2	33.3
B. Yes, sometimes	2	1	3	50.0
C. Seldom	0	0	0	0.

	P.S. 92	P.S. 175	Total #	Total %
5. What kinds of things does he (she) tell you? N=5				
A. About his (her) friends	1	0	1	20.0
B. About what he (she) does	3	1	4	80.0
C. About his (her) teacher Ø Multiple responses	0	2	2	40.0
6. Have you met your child's teacher? N=6				
A. Yes	2	2	4	66.7
B. No	2	0	2	33.3
7. If your child was having a problem in school, would you contact someone in the school concerning it?				
A. Yes	4	2	6	100.0
8. (If yes, ask) Who would you contact?				
A. The guidance counselor	0	1	1	16.7
B. The teacher	4	1	5	83.3
C. The principal	1	0	1	16.7
Ø Multiple answers				
9. Have you been visited by a family assistant?				
A. No	3	2	5	83.3
B. One came to the house, but I was not home	1	0	1	16.7
10. (If yes to question 3, ask) Does your child ever tell you about these guidance sessions? N=8				
A. Yes	4	3	7	87.5
B. No	1	0	1	12.5
Ø . Multiple Responses				
11. (If yes, ask) What kinds of things does he (she) tell you about them? N=8				
A. About the guidance counselor	1	1	2	25.0
B. About the educational assistant	0	1	1	12.5
C. About the things that he (she) does	2	2	4	50.0

	P.S. 92	P.S. 175	Total #	Total %
12. (If yes, ask) How do you think he (she) feels about them? N=7				
A. Likes them very much	3	1	4	57.1
B. Seems to like them better than regular school classes	1	1	2	28.5
C. Don't know	0	1	1	14.2
13. Has your child ever brought home anything that he (she) has done in these sessions? N=8				
A. Yes	2	2	4	50.0
B. No	3	1	4	50.0
14. Do you think that these guidance sessions are helping your child to adjust better to the school?				
A. Yes	4	2	6	75.0
B. No	0	1	1	12.5
C. Don't know	1	0	1	12.5
15. Do you know the guidance counselor?				
A. Yes	1	1	2	25.0
B. No	4	2	6	75.0
16. (If yes, ask) How would you rate the guidance counselor? N=2				
A. Very effective	0	1	1	50.0
B. Effective	0	0	0	33.3
C. No opinion	1	0	1	50.0
17. Why? N=2				
A. Warm and pleasant person	0	1	1	50.0
B. Only met her once	1	0	1	50.0
18. Have you been visited by a family assistant? N=8				
A. Yes	1	0	1	12.5
B. No	4	3	7	87.5

	P.S. 92	P.S. 175	Total #	Total %
19. If your child was having a problem in school would you contact someone at the school concerning it?				
A. Yes	5	3	8	100.0
20. Who would you contact?				
A. Guidance counselor	2	2	4	50.0
B. Teacher	3	1	4	50.0
C. Assistant Principal	1	0	1	12.5
Ø Multiple responses				
21. What would you suggest to improve the program? N=8				
A. More parental involvement	1	0	1	12.5
B. More individual help for the child	0	1	1	12.5
C. More pressure on child to do school work	1	0	1	12.5
D. No suggestion, okay as is	2	0	2	25.0
E. Don't know	1	2	3	27.5
Sex of interviewer				
Female	8	5	13	92.9
Male	1	0	1	7.1
Sex of child				
Female	2	0	2	14.2
Male	7	5	12	85.8
Grade of child				
1	1	0	1	7.1
2	1	4	5	35.7
3	6	1	7	50.0
4	1	0	1	7.1

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM
Teachers' Responses N=30

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S.124	P.S. 161	Total	%
1. Is this the first year that you have taught parental workshops?								
Yes	1	4	2	5	3	2	17	56.7
No	4	1	3	0	2	3	13	43.3
2. Do you think it has changed since -it began in 1967-68?								
Yes	2	1	2	0	2	2	9	69.6
No	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	23.7
No response	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	7.7
3. How do you think it has changed?								
Better organized	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5.9
Better curriculum	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	11.8
More and Better Materials	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	11.8
More parent participation	2	1	2	0	2	1	8	47.1
New teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
More experienced para-professionals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Less organized	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fewer para-professionals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Less parent participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.
Other								
(1) additional grade	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5.9
(2) don't know	2	3	1	5	0	2	13	76.4
4. How would you rate the Parental Involvement overall?								
Excellent	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	13.3
Good	2	2	3	1	2	1	11	36.7
Fair	0	2	1	3	1	2	9	30.0
Poor	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	10.0
No opinion	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	10.0
5. Why?								
(1) Got to know parents better	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	10.0
(2) Parents seemed more interested in school and their children	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	16.7
(3) Enough isn't done to overcome the language barrier	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	10.0
(4) Not enough parents are involved	0	3	3	4	1	2	13	43.3
(5) Excellent in some schools and poor in others	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3

	P.S. 10	P.S. 27	P.S. 45	P.S. 48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
(6) Coordinators have worked hard to get interesting programs	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	6.7
(7) Parents were not encouraged in the past	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
(8) Parents should be involved in more ways, consumer education, for example	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. How would you rate parents reaction to the workshops?								
Very enthusiastic	3	3	1	1	2	1	11	36.7
Enthusiastic	2	1	1	4	3	4	15	50.0
Fair	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not interested	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	10.0
Other								
(1)Apathetic	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
7. Do you have a curriculum plan for your workshop?								
Yes	5	5	2	5	4	5	26	86.7
No	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	10.0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(1) Parents observed, individualized reading	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
8. How did you obtain this curriculum?								
(1) Developed by the Program Director	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.8
(2) Adopted from another parental involvement program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(3) Developed jointly by Workshop Teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(4) Developed by self	5	5	2	5	4	3	24	92.3
(5) Other								
Based upon everyday experiences	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.8
Commercially prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	7.6
Topic List from District Office	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	7.6
9. What kinds of materials do you use in your Workshops?								
Books	3	4	4	4	1	3	19	63.3
Commercially developed	1	3	1	0	1	1	7	23.3
Objects from parents and childrens' environment	1	1	3	0	1	1	7	23.3

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
Personally created	4	1	2	3	3	2	15	50.0
All of above	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other								
(1) Audio-visual	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	6.7
(2) Blackboard, paper and pencils	1	2	0	1	0	3	7	23.3
(3) Games	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	10.0
10. Have you ever taught a parental workshop other than this one?								
Yes	5	2	0	0	1	1	9	30.0
No	0	3	5	5	4	4	21	70.0
11. Where?								
School								
P.S. 18	5	1	0	0	0	0	6	51.7
P.S. 25	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	11.1
P.S. 27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	11.1
P.S. 48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	11.1
P.S. 49	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	11.1
P.S. 124	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	11.1
P.S. 161	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	33.3
Long Island	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	11.1
Program Type:								
(1) Parental Involvement	PI	PI	-	-	-	PI	-	-
(2) Head Start	-	-	-	-	HS	-	-	-
12. How long did you teach this program?								
Less than one year	0	2	0	0	0	4	6	51.7
One-two years	5	1	0	0	0	0	6	51.7
More than two years	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	11.1
Specify Number								
13. Did you have any orientation or planning session prior to beginning to teach the Workshops?								
Yes	2	1	2	3	2	1	11	36.7
No	3	4	3	2	3	4	19	63.3
14. How much?								
One-two days	2	1	2	3	2	1	11	100
Three-four days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Five days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
More than five days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
15. With whom did you have these orientation or planning sessions?								
Program Director	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	36.3
Other Workshop Teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Classroom teachers	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	9.1
College or University Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All of Above	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other								
(1) Assistant Principal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.1
(2) District Librarian	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	9.1
(3) Coordinator	0	0	2	2	2	1	7	63.3
16. Have you attended any planning sessions since?								
No response	0	3	0	2	0	4	9	30.0
Yes	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
No	5	2	4	3	5	1	20	66.7
17. How many?								
One	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	100
Two	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Three	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
More than three	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Specify								
18. With whom did you have these planning sessions?								
Program Director	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Workshop Teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Classroom Teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
College or University personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All of above	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other								
(1) Coordinator	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	100
19. Do you have a para-professional assigned to your workshop?								
Yes	0	0	2	0	1	2	5	16.7
No	5	5	2	4	2	3	21	70.0
Don't know	0	0	1	1	2	0	4	13.3

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
20. What are her duties and responsibilities?								
Works directly with parents	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assists teacher with records and paper work	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	60.0
Assist teacher with collection of materials and planning sessions	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	60.0
None of the above	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other								
(1) Works with children	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	20.0
(2) Makes home visits	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	20.0
21. To whom in the para-professional responsible?								
Workshop Teacher	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	20.0
Classroom Teacher	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	40.0
Program Director	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	20.0
Other								
(1) District Headquarters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Assistant Principal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. What is your relationship to the Program Director?								
Works closely with her	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Receive materials and suggestions from her	3	1	0	4	2	2	12	38.9
Have little contact with her	2	2	1	0	0	3	8	26.7
Other								
(1) Co-worker	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
(2) None	0	0	4	1	3	0	8	26.7
(3) Contact by way of meetings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23. What would you suggest to improve the Workshops?								
Expand the program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hire more experienced teachers	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
Develop better curriculum	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	6.7
Have more planning sessions	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
Obtain more and better materials	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
Have better organization	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
Hire more para-professionals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No suggestion	2	1	1	1	0	0	5	16.7
Other								
(1) Get teachers to conduct workshops with own parents	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	6.7
(2) Someway of eliminating the language barrier	1	0	2	0	1	1	5	16.7

	PS.18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
(3) Special classroom for Workshops	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	6.7
(4) Let parents conduct some workshops	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	6.7
(5) Get more parents to attend	0	3	0	3	2	3	11	36.7
24. New York Teaching License Held								
(1) Regular								
Common Branches	3	4	1	1	2	3	14	46.7
Early Childhood	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	10.0
Speech Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
(2) Substitute								
Common Branches	1	0	2	4	3	1	11	36.7
Early Childhood	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
(3) Ancillary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Subject(s) Presently Teaching								
Common Branches	4	3	3	4	2	1	17	56.7
Early Childhood	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Librarian	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	6.7
Social Studies	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
Reading	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reading and Mathematics	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
Music and Mathematics	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
P.E.	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
T.E.S.L.	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
Speech Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
Reading - Non-English Speaking Children	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
Mathematics	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
Teacher Trainer	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
Coordinator	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sex Education Coordinator District Office	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
26. Grade Level								
All	0	2	1	0	0	2	5	16.7
First	4	0	3	0	0	1	8	26.7
Second	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	13.3
Third	0	2	0	2	1	0	5	16.7
Fourth	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
Fifth	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
Sixth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
First-Second	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
Second-Sixth	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
Third-Sixth	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
Fourth Cluster	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
Fifth-Sixth	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
None teaching	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
Assistant Principal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Years of Teaching Experience								
Less than one year	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
One-five years	1	0	3	4	2	1	11	36.7
Six-ten years	1	1	1	0	0	2	5	16.7
Eleven-fifteen years	2	1	1	0	2	1	7	23.3
Sixteen-twenty years	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	10.0
Twenty-one- Twenty-five years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Twenty-six-Thirty years	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
Thirty-one-Thirty-five years	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
Thirty-six-Forty years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forty-one-Forty-five years								

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

Responses of Parents Who Attended Workshops Regularly N=30

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S. 124	P.S. 161	Total	%
1. How many workshops for parents have you attended at P.S.								
5-10	0	3	0	4	2	0	9	30.0
11-15	0	2	0	1	3	3	9	30.0
16-20	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6.7
more than 20	5	0	5	0	0	0	10	33.0
don*t know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. How did you find out about the workshops?								
posters	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
newsletters from school	5	3	5	2	2	3	20	66.7
verbal information from child	0	3	0	0	1	0	4	13.3
verbal information from another parent	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
visit from family assistant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
work in school	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	13.3
flyers from school	0	1	0	3	0	0	4	13.3
phone calls	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
a friend	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
3. What do you think the purpose of the workshops is?								
-to tell us how our children are learning	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	10.0
-to teach us how to help our child learn	4	5	1	5	4	5	24	80.0
-to help us become more familiar with the school	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
-other								
a. help mothers help children w/school work	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
b. something good	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
c. helpful for children	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	6.7
d. help parents w/reading problems	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
4. Do you know that babysitters are available to take care of your younger children while you attend the workshops?								
yes	4	4	5	5	5	5	28	93.3
no	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
5. Have you left your children with the babysitter								
yes	2	1	1	1	2	2	9	32.1
no	2	4	4	4	2	3	19	67.9

	18	27	43	48	124	161	Total	%
6. Why not								
-children too young	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-children afraid of stranger	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-have a relative or friend to stay with children	2	0	0	2	0	0	4	21.0
-other								
a. children are in school	1	1	0	2	0	2	6	31.5
b. don't have any small children	0	2	4	0	1	1	8	42.1
c. able to stay at home without supervision	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5.4
7. Have the Workshops that you attended given you any ideas about how to help your child learn to read?								
yes	5	2	5	2	5	5	24	80.0
no	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	6.7
some of them	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	10.0
other-my child reads well	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
don't know	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
Give examples-								
1. don't know	0	2	0	1	0	1	4	13.3
2. visit classes in 1,2,3rd	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
3. workshops attended were most concerned w/math. teaching	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	10.0
4. strengthened skills in phonics	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
5. better understanding of words	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	6.7
8. Have you tried to use any of these ideas with your child?								
yes	5	5	5	3	5	5	28	93,3
no	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
sometimes	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
9. Do you think that they have helped your child learn to read better?								
yes	5	4	4	3	5	5	26	86.7
a little	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
no	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
don't know	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
other								
1. don't understand well enough to help children	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
10. Do you receive the newspaper called the "Reader's Reader"								
yes	5	3	5	4	3	4	24	80.0
no	0	2	0	1	2	1	6	20.0

	18	27	43	48	124	161	Total	%
11. Has it given you any ideas about how to help your child learn to read?								
yes	5	2	3	1	3	4	18	75.0
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
sometimes	0	1	2	2	1	0	6	25.0
12. Have you been visited by a family assistant from the school?								
yes	4	1	0	1	0	0	6	20.0
no	1	4	5	4	5	5	24	80.0
13. Have you met your child's teacher?								
yes	5	5	5	5	5	4	29	96.7
no	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
14. Do you feel free to contact your child's teacher and discuss his or her progress?								
yes	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	100.0
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
partially	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15. If your child was having a problem would you discuss the problem with someone in the school?								
yes	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	100.0
no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
perhaps	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. With whom would you discuss the problem?								
principal	5	2	0	2	0	0	9	30.0
teacher	5	3	5	3	4	4	24	80.0
guidance counselor	0	3	0	0	1	1	5	16.7
family assistant	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
other								
bi-lingual teacher	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
17. Why wouldn't you discuss the child's problem with anyone in the school?								
don't know anyone in the school	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
don't think they would help	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
language difficulty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

18. What would you suggest to improve the program?	18	27	43	48	124	161	Total	%
-better organization	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-more training for teachers and para-professionals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
-more para-professionals in the program	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
-better books and materials	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
-no suggestion	5	3	2	1	0	3	14	46.7
-other								
a. more letters to parents	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	6.7
b. include children in program	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	6.7
c. more home visits	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
d. have suggestion box	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
e. add different areas to the curriculum-such as math.	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
f. stress science and math.	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
g. more relevancy to parents' needs	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	6.7
h. add sex education, more films of a good nature	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.3
i. get more parents to attend	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	10.0
j. add more and better films	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

Responses of Parents Who Attended Workshops Sometimes N=30

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S. 124	P.S. 161	Total	%
1. How many workshops for parents have you attended at P.S.____								
one	1	0	1	2	0	0	4	13.3
two	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	13.3
three	3	1	3	0	1	1	9	30.0
more than three	0	4	0	3	3	3	13	43.3
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. How did you find out about the workshops?								
posters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
newsletter from school	5	2	0	2	3	4	16	53.3
verbal information from child	0	0	3	0	1	0	4	13.3
another parent	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
visit from family assistant	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	10.0
other								
a. work in the school	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	6.7
b. letter from teacher	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
c. being present at school when a workshop was held	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
d. flyers	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
e. community room at the school	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	6.7
3. What do you think is the purpose of the workshops?								
to tell us how our children are learning	0	1	0	3	2	2	8	26.7
to teach us how to help our children learn to read	5	2	1	2	4	3	17	56.7
to help us become more familiar with the schools	0	0	1	1	2	1	5	16.7
don't know	0	1	4	1	0	0	6	20.0
other								
a. to assist the child w/learning	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	6.7
b. help parents get acquainted	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
4. Would you like to attend more workshops if possible?								
yes	5	4	4	4	5	5	27	90.0
no	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	6.7
perhaps	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Why have you been unable to attend more workshops?								
employed during day	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	13.3
too busy with home and children	2	3	1	3	2	5	16	53.3
have smaller children in the home	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	6.7
do not understand what the workshops are	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S. 124	P.S. 161	Total	%
5. (cont.)								
language difficulty	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
transportation difficulty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other								
a. must help my mother during day	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
b. work during the day	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	6.7
c. attend clinic twice a week	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
d. the workshops are not meaningful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
e. illness	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
f. didn't know of them	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
6. Do you know that baby sitters are available to take care of your younger children while you attend?								
yes	4	5	3	4	5	4	25	83.3
no	1	0	2	1	0	1	5	16.7
7. Have you left your children with the babysitter when you attended workshops?								
yes	2	0	3	4	1	2	12	40.0
no	3	5	2	1	4	3	18	60.0
8. Why not?								
children too young	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.5
children afraid of strangers	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5.5
have relative or friend to stay w/children	1	1	1	0	0	2	5	27.7
other								
a. children are in school	1	1	1	1	3	1	8	44.4
b. no younger children	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.5
c. my child is sick	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.5
d. old enough to play without my supervision	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.5
9. Would you like to attend workshops if they were held during evenings?								
yes	1	1	1	1	4	2	10	33.3
no	4	1	2	0	0	1	8	26.7
perhaps	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	6.7
no response	0	3	2	3	0	2	10	33.3
10. Have the workshops that you attended given you any ideas about how to help your child learn to read?								
yes	5	4	4	4	5	5	27	90.0
no	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	10.0
some of them	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
examples--								
dictionary skills	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6.7
don't know	2	1	0	0	2	0	5	16.7
a. help me to explain the meaning of pictures in books	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
b. helps me with pronounciation	0	0	1	1	2	0	4	13.3
c. child is reading better	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
d. doing much better in math.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S. 124	P.S. 161	Total	%
11. Do you receive the "Reader's Reader"?								
yes	5	3	3	3	2	4	20	66.7
no	0	2	2	2	3	1	10	33.3
12. Has it given you any ideas about how to teach your child to read?								
yes	5	3	1	2	1	2	14	70.0
no	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	15.0
sometimes	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	15.0
13. Have you been visited by a family assistant								
yes	0	1	2	0	0	1	4	13.3
no	5	4	3	5	5	4	26	86.7
14. Have you met your child's teacher?								
yes	5	5	4	5	5	5	29	96.7
no	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
15. Do you feel free to contact your child's teacher and discuss his or her progress?								
yes	5	5	4	5	5	5	29	96.7
no	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
partially	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. If your child were having a problem would you discuss the problem w/someone at school?								
yes	5	5	3	5	5	5	28	93.3
no	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	6.7
perhaps	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. With whom would you discuss the problem?								
principal	4	2	1	3	1	1	12	42.8
teacher	2	1	3	5	4	2	17	60.7
guidance counselor	1	0	0	2	1	1	5	17.8
family assistant	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	6.1
don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other								
a. bi-lingual teacher	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.5
b. assistant principal	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.5
18. Why wouldn't you discuss your child's problem w/anyone in the school?								
don't know anyone in the school	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
don't think they would help	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
language difficulty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other								
a. depends on nature of problem	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	50.0
b. no problems	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	50.0

	P.S. 18	P.S. 27	P.S. 43	P.S. 48	P.S. 124	P.S. 161	Total	%
19. What would you suggest to improve the program?								
better organization	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
more training for teachers and para-professionals	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
more para-professionals in the organization	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
better books and materials	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.3
no suggestion, o.k. as is	4	5	2	3	4	5	23	76.7
other								
a. getting more parents to attend	1	0	0	2	2	0	5	16.7
b. coordinator should be Spanish	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
c. ways of overcoming the language barrier, coordinator should be able to speak Spanish	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
d. it should be continued	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3

Responses of Parents Who Never Attended Workshop N=30

	P.S.18	P.S.27	P.S.43	P.S.48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
1. Do you know that there are workshops for parents at P.S. ____?								
Yes	5	3	3	3	3	3	20	66.7
No	0	2	2	2	2	2	10	33.3
2. How did you find out about the workshops?								
A poster								
Newsletter from school	5	2	2	3	4	3	19	63.3
Verbal information from child	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Verbal information from another parent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Visit from family assistant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(1) Works at school	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
(2) PTA Meeting	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.3
No response	0	2	2	2	1	2	9	30.0
3. What do you think is the purpose of the workshops?								
To tell us how our children are learning	3	0	0	1	1	0	5	16.7
To teach us how to help our children learn	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	10.0
To help us become more familiar with the school	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	10.0
Don't know	1	3	3	4	3	1	15	30.0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	13.3
4. Would you like to attend the workshops if possible?								
Yes	4	4	0	1	5	1	15	30.0
No	1	1	2	3	0	1	8	26.7
Perhaps	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	6.7
Don't know	0	0	2	1	0	2	5	16.7

	P.S.18	P.S.27	P.S.43	P.S.48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
5. Why have you been unable to attend?								
Employed during day	2	2	1	3	2	0	10	33.3
Too busy with home and children	2	1	1	1	0	2	7	23.3
Have smaller children	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	6.7
Don't understand what workshops are	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Language difficulty	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	13.3
Transportation difficulty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other								
(1) Recently had a baby	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
(2) Illness	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	6.7
(3) Was only Negro parent present	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
(4) Have retarded child	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3.3
(5) Didn't know about workshops	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	6.7
6. Do you know that babysitters are available to take care of your younger children while attending workshops								
No response	0	0	2	0	0	3	5	16.7
Yes	4	5	2	3	3	2	19	63.3
No	1	0	1	2	2	0	6	20.0
7. Would you be interested in attending the workshops if they were held during the evening?								
Yes	2	0	1	0	4	4	11	36.7
No	2	2	2	4	1	1	12	40.0
Perhaps	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	13.3
Don't know	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	10.0
8. Do you receive the newspaper about the workshops called the "Readers' Reader"?								
Yes	1	2	3	0	0	3	9	30.0
No	4	3	2	5	5	2	21	70.0
Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Has it given you any ideas about how to help your child learn to read?								
Yes	1	1	3	0	0	1	6	66.6
No	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	22.2
Sometimes	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	11.2
the	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	0

	P.S.18	P.S.27	P.S.43	P.S.48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
10. Have you been visited by a family assistant from the school?								
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	100
11. Have you met your child's teacher?								
Yes	5	5	4	5	5	3	27	90.0
No	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	10.0
12. Do you feel free to contact your child's teacher and discuss his or her progress?								
Yes	5	4	5	5	5	5	29	96.7
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Partially	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. If your child was having a problem would you discuss the problem with someone in the school?								
Yes	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	100
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Perhaps	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. With whom would you discuss the problem?								
Principal	0	1	1	1	1	1	5	16.7
Teacher	3	3	4	2	1	5	18	60.0
Guidance Counselor	2	1	1	2	3	0	9	30.0
Family Assistant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15. Why wouldn't you discuss the child's problem with anybody in the school?								
Don't know anyone in the school	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't think they would help	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Language difficulty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	P.S.18	P.S.27	P.S.43	P.S.48	P.S.124	P.S.161	Total	%
16. What would you suggest to improve the program?								
Better organization	1	2	0	1	2	0	6	20.0
More training for teachers and para-professionals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	6.7
More para-professionals in the program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Better books and materials	3	0	0	3	1	0	7	23.3
No suggestions, okay as is	1	1	0	1	1	0	4	13.3
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(1) Getting more parents to attend	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.3
(2) Don't know	0	1	5	0	0	5	11	36.7

CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION AND VIDEO TAPE RECORDING PROGRAM

Responses of Teachers That Were Taped N=15

	P.S.98	P.S.133	P.S.136	Total	%
1. How were you selected to make a tape(s)?					
I volunteered	3	2	0	5	33.3
I was assigned	0	1	2	3	20.0
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Asked to come and observe lesson	2	2	2	6	40.0
New teacher wanted practice	0	0	1	1	6.6
2. By whom were you assigned?					
Program Director	0	2	5	7	46.6
Principal	0	0	0	0	0
Department Chairman	0	2	0	2	13.3
Other					
Assistant Principal	4	1	0	5	33.3
Teacher in Charge	1	0	0	1	6.6
3. How was the subject matter for the tape selected?					
I was informed that I was to tape in the -- area	0	1	2	3	20.0
I chose my own area	3	4	0	7	46.6
I don't know	0	0	0	0	0
Other					
My subject area	2	0	3	5	33.3
4. Was this the first tape you made?					
Yes	5	5	5	15	100
No	0	0	0	0	0
5. How many tapes did you make before?					
Number	0	0	0	0	0
Question #5 not applicable					
6. Please list the specific areas:					
Industrial Arts	2	0	0	2	13.3
Reading	1	0	0	1	6.6
Social Studies	1	0	0	1	6.6
Pollination Science	1	0	0	1	6.6
Evaporation	0	1	0	1	6.6
English Literature	0	1	0	1	6.6
Music	0	1	0	1	6.6
Mathematics	0	1	0	1	6.6
No response	0	1	5	6	40.0
7. Did you attend any training sessions before your taping?					
Yes	2	3	2	7	46.6
No	3	1	3	7	46.6
Other (short briefing)	0	1	0	1	6.6

	P.S.98	P.S.133	P.S.136	Total	%
8. How many training sessions have you attended? (N = 7)					
1-2 sessions	2	3	2	7	100
3-4 sessions	0	0	0	0	0
5 sessions	0	0	0	0	0
More than 5 sessions	0	0	0	0	0
9. How many people were in each of the training sessions? (N = 7)					
Individual sessions	2	3	2	7	100
2-9	0	0	0	0	0
10 or more	0	0	0	0	0
10. Who did the training? (N = 7)					
Program Director	1	4	2	7	100
Other school personnel	2	0	0	2	28.5
Other	0	0	0	0	0
11. Did you find the sessions helpful in making this tape? (N - 7)					
Yes	2	3	2	7	100
No	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
12. Why? Explain (N = 7)					
Technical aspects	0	1	0	1	14.2
Preparation for success	1	0	0	1	14.2
It was on where and when	1	0	0	1	14.2
Helped to ease tension	0	1	0	1	14.2
Prepared me for audio-visual problems in student orchestral performance	0	1	0	1	14.2
Motivated teacher	0	0	1	1	14.2
No reply	0	0	1	1	14.2
13. Was the lesson that you taped taught by you in a class prior to taping?					
Yes	0	2	2	4	26.6
No	5	3	3	11	73.0
14. How would you rate the CCTV and UTR program overall?					
Excellent	3	3	2	8	53.3
Good	0	1	2	3	20.0
Fair	1	1	0	2	13.3
Poor	0	0	0	0	0
No opinion	1	0	1	2	13.3

	P.S.98	P.S.133	P.S.136	Total	%
15. Why?					
Teachers can improve performance in classroom	1	2	0	3	20.0
Good teaching aid	1	1	1	3	20.0
Only know about my tape	1	0	0	1	6.6
We can play back for children to reinforce good and bad points	1	0	0	1	6.6
No real contact with program	1	0	1	2	13.3
Not enough follow-up	0	0	1	1	6.6
Class was affected by presence of equipment	0	1	0	1	6.6
Cannot offer any valid criticism	0	1	0	1	6.6
Not enough equipment available	0	0	1	1	6.6
Circulation of films for everyone's benefit	0	0	1	1	6.6
16. Are there any aspects of the CCTV and VTR program that you feel have not been implemented?					
Yes	0	1	3	4	26.6
No	5	3	2	10	66.0
No response	0	1	0	1	6.6
17. What are they? (N =4)					
Don't know	1	0	0	1	25.0
Mass education system	0	0	1	1	25.0
Program too new	0	1	0	1	25.0
Better professional preparation	0	1	0	1	25.0
School not fully utilizing tool	0	0	1	1	25.0
Not enough involvement	0	0	1	1	25.0
18. Are there any external factors that you feel may be having a detrimental effect on the program?					
Yes	1	3	2	6	40.0
No	4	2	3	9	60.0
19. What are they? (N =6)					
Sound of motors in instrument	1	0	0	1	16.6
Don't know	1	1	0	2	33.3
Students not exposed enough	0	0	1	1	16.6
Change of room, locale of microphone	0	1	0	1	16.6
Not enough time for playback	0	2	1	3	50.0

	P.S.98	P.S.133	P.S.136	Total	%
20. What would you suggest to improve the program?					
Expand the program	1	3	1	5	33.3
More training for para-professionals	0	0	0	0	0
Establish criteria for defining a "good teaching" tape and a "poor teaching" tape	1	4	0	5	33.3
Have more planning sessions	1	5	0	6	40.0
Have better organization	1	3	0	4	26.6
No suggestion, o.k. as is	1	0	1	2	13.3
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Large physical plant for a performance of this kind	1	0	0	1	6.6
More help for teacher in charge setting it up	1	0	0	1	6.6
More follow up	0	1	1	2	13.3
Use music as an introduction and have more audio and video props to reinforce learning	0	1	0	1	6.6
Special quarters for taping	0	0	1	1	6.6
Cross-section of ideas of staff	0	0	1	1	6.6
21. Are you aware of any effects, positive or negative, that the CCTV and VTR program has had on the rest of the school?					
Yes	3	0	4	7	46.6
No	2	5	1	8	53.3
22. Please discuss: (N =7)					
Children well motivated	1	0	1	2	28.5
Would make students more interested	1	0	2	3	42.3
Constructive for improvement learning	1	0	0	1	14.2
Too early to assess change	0	1	0	1	14.2
Should be incorporated with school program	0	0	1	1	14.2
23. Do you wish to see this program funded for another year?					
Yes	5	5	5	15	100
No	0	0	0	0	0
24. Why? N = 15					
All teachers should observe each other	2	1	0	3	20.0
For motivation of pupils	2	0	0	2	13.3
Beneficial to students and teachers	1	0	1	2	13.3
Excellent teacher training device	1	2	2	5	33.3
More feedback - more interaction	0	0	1	1	6.6
Too early to assess change	0	1	0	1	6.6
Circulation of films to all teachers	0	0	1	1	6.6
Sex:					
Male	5	4	4	13	86.6
Female	0	1	1	2	13.3

	P.S.98	P.S.133	P.S.136	Total	%
Age range:					
21-25	0	2	3	5	33.3
26-30	1	2	1	4	26.6
31-35	1	0	1	2	13.3
36-40	1	0	0	1	6.6
41-49	1	1	0	2	13.3
50-56	1	0	0	1	6.6
Type of license held:					
Regular-	5	4	2	11	73.6
Subjects:					
Industrial Arts	2	0	0	2	13.3
Common Branches	1	0	0	1	6.6
Social Studies	1	0	2	3	20.0
General Science	1	1	0	2	13.3
Corrective Reading	0	1	0	1	6.6
English	0	1	0	1	6.6
Music	0	1	0	1	6.6
Mathematics	0	1	0	1	6.6
Substitute-	0	0	3	3	20.0
Subjects:					
General Science	0	0	1	1	6.6
Mathematics	0	0	1	1	6.6
English	0	0	1	1	6.6
Ancillary-	0	0	0	0	0
Subjects:					
Subjects presently teaching:					
Graphic Arts	1	0	0	1	6.6
Corrective Reading	1	1	0	2	13.3
Social Studies	1	0	1	2	13.3
Industrial Arts	1	0	0	1	6.6
General Science	1	1	1	3	20.0
English	0	1	1	2	13.3
Orchestral Music	0	1	0	1	6.6
Mathematics	0	1	0	1	6.6
Mathematics and Algebra	0	0	2	2	13.3
Grade level:					
Eighth	0	0	2	2	13.3
Ninth	1	2	2	5	33.3
Seventh, eighth, ninth	2	3	0	5	33.3
Eighth and ninth	1	0	1	2	13.3
Seventh and ninth	1	0	0	1	6.6
Number of years of teaching experience:					
1 - 5 years	1	4	3	8	53.3
6 - 10 years	3	0	1	4	26.6
11-15 years	0	1	1	2	13.3
16-20 years	1	0	0	1	6.6

CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION AND VIDEO TAPE RECORDING PROGRAM

Responses of Teachers Who Have Seen Tapes N=15

	P.S.98	P.S. 133	P.S. 136	Totals	%
1. How many video tapings have you seen?					
None	0	0	0	0	0
1-2	5	4	5	14	93.3
3-4	0	1	0	1	6.6
2. Which ones have you seen?					
Social Studies	2	0	0	2	13.3
Science	2	2	1	5	33.3
Industrial Arts	1	0	0	1	6.6
Mathematics	0	2	1	3	20.0
Reading	0	1	0	1	6.6
English	0	1	0	1	6.6
Music	0	1	1	2	13.3
Afro-American History	0	0	1	1	6.6
Poetry	0	0	1	1	6.6
3. Have you attended teacher training sessions related to CCTV?					
Yes	3	0	1	4	26.6
No	2	5	4	11	73.3
4. (If yes) How many have you attended?					
1-2 sessions	3	0	1	4	100
3-4 sessions	0	0	0	0	0
5. How have these sessions helped you?					
Good preparation	1	0	1	2	50
Not very helpful	2	0	0	2	50
6. Have you CCTV in your classroom?					
Yes	2	4	4	10	66.6
No	3	1	1	5	33.3
7. (If yes) For which subject area have you used CCTV in your classroom?					
Social Studies	2	0	0	2	20
General Science	0	2	1	3	30
Mathematics-Ratio	0	1	1	2	20
Music	0	1	1	2	20
English	0	0	1	1	10

	P.S. 98	P.S. 133	P.S. 136	Totals	%
8. What do you think the class got out of it?					
Good introduction	0	0	1	1	10
Held their attention	1	0	1	2	10
Reinforced earlier lessons	1	1	0	2	20
No response	0	2	0	2	20
Helps them correct errors	0	1	0	1	10
Not sure	0	0	1	1	10
Good when teacher absent	0	0	1	1	10
Class able to learn	0	0	1	1	10
9. To what extent was the CCTV able to hold the class's interest?					
Always	0	1	3	4	40
Usually	2	3	1	6	60
Rarely	0	0	0	0	0
Never	0	0	0	0	0
Most of the students	1	1	3	5	50
Half the students	1	3	1	5	50
Few of students	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	0	0	0
10. Have your students expressed a desire for more programs of this type?					
Yes	0	3	3	6	60
No	0	1	0	1	10
Don't know	2	0	1	3	30
11. How would you rate CCTV and VTR overall?					
Excellent	0	1	3	4	26.6
Good	3	4	1	8	53.3
Fair	1	0	1	2	13.3
Poor	0	0	0	0	0
No opinion	1	0	0	1	6.6
12. Why?					
Good potential - needs expanding	3	1	0	4	26.6
Purposeful and meaningful goals	1	0	0	1	6.6
Don't know	1	1	0	2	13.3
Good learning device	0	1	1	2	13.3
Good review	0	1	0	1	6.6
No response	0	2	2	4	26.6
Good motivation	0	1	2	3	20.0
Not well publicized	0	0	0	0	0

	P.S. 98	P.S. 133	P.S. 136	Totals	
13. Are there any aspects of CCTV and VTR program that you feel have not been implemented?					
Yes	0	0	0	0	0
No	3	1	4	8	53.3
Don't know	2	4	1	7	46.6
14. Are there any external factors that may have a detrimental effect on the program?					
Yes	0	1	0	1	6.6
No	3	2	5	10	66.6
Don't know	2	2	0	4	26.6
15. (If yes) What are they? (N=1)					
Not any time for planning	0	1	0	1	100
16. Suggestions to improve programs.					
More training for para-professionals	0	0	0	0	0
Criteria for good and poor tapes	1	1	0	2	13.6
More planning sessions	0	1	2	3	20.0
Better organization	1	1	2	4	26.6
No suggestion, o.k. as is	1	1	2	4	26.6
Publicize the program	1	0	0	1	6.6
Expanded	1	1	0	2	13.6
17. Are you aware of any positive or negative effects of CCTV or VTR on rest of school?					
Yes	0	0	0	0	0
No	5	5	5	15	100
18. Do you wish to see this program funded for another year?					
Yes	5	5	5	15	100
No	0	0	0	0	0
19. Why?					
No response	2	1	2	5	33.3
Instrument for teacher training	2	2	0	4	26.6
Stimulating device for training	1	0	0	1	6.6
Beneficial for teachers and kids	0	1	2	3	20.
Can be used for phonics lesson	0	1	1	2	13.3
Should be expanded	0	0	2	2	13.3

	P.S. 98	P.S. 133	P.S. 136	Totals	
20. Regular license in:					
Social Studies	2	1	1	4	33.3
Science	2	1	1	4	33.3
Industrial Arts	1	0	0	1	8.3
Mathematics	0	1	1	2	16.6
Music	0	1	1	2	16.6
Health Conservation	0	1	0	1	8.3
21. Substitute licenses in following :					
General Science	1	1	0	2	66.6
English	0	0	1	1	33.3
22. I am teaching the subject I have my license in.					
Yes	5	5	5	15	100
No	0	0	0	0	0
23. Grade levels:					
7-9	2	3	1	6	40.0
8-9	3	1	0	4	26.6
7-8	0	1	1	2	13.3
9	0	0	1	1	6.6
7	0	0	1	1	6.6
8	0	0	1	1	6.6
24. Years teaching experience:					
1-5	1	0	2	3	20.0
6-10	1	4	1	6	40.0
11-15	2	1	1	4	26.6
16-20	1	0	1	2	13.3
25. Age:					
20-25	0	0	1	1	6.6
26-30	2	3	1	6	40.0
31-35	0	0	2	2	13.3
36-40	1	1	0	2	13.3
41-45	1	1	0	2	13.3
46-50	1	0	1	2	13.3
26. Race					
White	5	2	3	10	66.3
Black	0	2	1	3	20.0
Puerto Rican	0	0	0	0	0
No Response	0	1	1	2	13.3

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

Page

READING AND LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

Interview Schedule for Teachers B1
Interview Schedule for Parents B10

CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION AND VIDEO TAPE RECORDING PROGRAM

Interview Schedule for Para-Professionals B15
Interview Schedule for Teachers That Were Taped B23
Interview Schedule for Teachers Who Have Seen Tapes B27

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

Interview Schedule for Classroom Teachers B31
Interview Schedule for CHIP Teachers B37
Interview Schedule for Teacher Aides B44
Interview Schedule for Parents B53
Interview of Content Knowledge for Children in CHIP Program B58

MOTIVATION FOR LEARNING PROGRAM

Classroom Teachers' Scale for Rating Children B62
Interview Schedule for Teachers B65
Interview Schedule for Parents B69
Interview Schedule for Family Assistants B74
Interview Schedule for Educational Assistants B85

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

Interview Schedule for Parents Who Have Attended Workshops 2-3 Times B96
Interview Schedule for Parental Workshop Teachers B100
Interview Schedule for Family Assistants B105
Interview Schedule for Parents Who Attend Workshops Regularly B114
Interview Schedule for Parents Who Have Not Attended Workshops B118

Reading and Language Arts Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS

1. How many years have you been a teacher? ____________(Specify #)

2. How many years have you taught first grade? ____________(Specify #)

3. How many years have you taught second grade? ____________(Specify #)

4. What is the extent of your formal education?

   ___A.B. degree

   ___M.A. degree

   ___Ph.D. degree

   ___Ed.D. degree

   ___Professional Certificate

   ___Other (Specify) ______________________________

5. How many college or in-service courses have you taken that dealt specifically with the teaching of reading?

   ___One

   ___Two

   ___Three

   ___Four

   ___Five

   ___More than five (Specify # _____)

6. How much special training did you receive for this program?

   ___One - two days

   ___Three - four days

   ___One - two weeks

   ___More than two weeks (Specify #) ________

7. How would you rate the length of this training period?

   ___Adequate

   ___Less than adequate

   ___Inadequate

   ___No opinion

   ___Other (Specify) ______________________________

   ____

8. Why (Get specifics) ____

____

____

9. How would you rate the quality of this training?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion

___Other (Specify))____

____

10. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

____

11. In what specific areas should additional training be given?

___Dividing the class into groups according to problems and needs.

___Presenting the lesson

___Reinforcing the skills

___Working with "Slow" members of the class

___Setting up "machines" for class

___Running "machines"

___Other (Specify areas) ____

12. Have you received additional training since the program began?

___Yes ___No

13. (If yes, ask:) How often does training take place?

___Once a week ___Twice a week

___Once a month ___Twice a month

___Other (Specify) ____

14. How long are the sessions?

___Less than one hour

___One hour

___Two hours

___More than two hours (Specify) ______________________________

15. If answer to question 12 is no, ask:) Should there be in-service training for teachers in this program?

___Yes

___No

___Don't know

16. (If yes, ask:) How many sessions?

___1 - 5

___6 - 10

___11 - 15

___More than fifteen (Specify #) __________

17. How long should these sessions be?

___Less than one hour

___One hour

___Two hours

___More than two hours (Specify) ___________________________

18. How frequently should the sessions be held?

___Once a week

___Twice a week

___Once a month

___Twice a month

___Other (Specify) ____

19. How would you rate your relationship with the program director?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion

___Other (Describe relationship) ______________________________

____

20. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

21. How can your relationship with the program director be improved? Explain:

____

____

22. How would you rate your relationship with the reading clinician?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion

___Other (Describe relationship) ______________________________

____

23. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

24. How can your relationship with the reading clinician be improved? Explain:

____

____

25. How would you rate your relationship with the teacher aide?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion

___Other (Describe relationship) ____

____

26. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

27. In which areas do you feel that this program is most successful?

____

____

____

28. In which areas do you feel that this program is least successful?

____

____

____

29. With which of the special procedures in this program have you experienced success?

____

____

____

30. With which of the special procedures in this program have you not experienced success?

____

____

____

31. How would you rate the quality of the instruction provided for word analysis?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion

___Other (Specify) ____

32. How would you rate the quality of the instruction provided for development of verbal skills?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ______________________________________

33. How would you rate the quality of the instruction provided for auditory discrimination?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ______________________________________

34. How would you rate the quality of the instruction provided for visual discrimination?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ______________________________________

35. How would you rate the progress of the students in this program?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No progress

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

36. How does the progress of this group compare with the progress of other groups that you have taught that did not use the "Machines"?

___Greater progress

___Less progress

___About the same

___Cannot say

37. How would you rate the behavior or the group in the program compared with other groups that you have taught that did not use the "machines"?

___More disciplined

___Less disciplined

___Greater interest

___Less interest

___No opinion

___Other (Specify) ____

38. How would you evaluate the program overall?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

___Other (Specify)____

39. Why do you think that the program is (very effective, effective, or ineffective)? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Has real meaning for the children

___Stimulates children's interest in reading

___The idea of the program is good, but it needs better organization

___The program needs more personnel

___The program does not capture the interest of the children

___The program is disorganized

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

40. How do you think that the children like the program?

___Very much

___O.K.

___Not very much

___Don't know

___No opinion

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

41. Would you like to teach in this program next year?

___Yes ___No

42. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

43. What would you suggest to improve the program? (Get specifics) __________

____

Name ______________________________ Sex ______(M/F)

School ______________ Age _______

New York City teaching licenses held:

A. Regular licenses in the following subjects: ______________________

____

B. Substitute licenses in the following subjects: ________________

____

C. Ancillary licenses: ____

D. The subject (s) I am presently teaching is (are): ______________

____

E. Grade level (s): ____

F. Total number of years of teaching experience: ____________

Reading and Language Arts Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARENTS

1. Do you think that it is important for the schools to have special classes to help the children learn to read better?

   ___Yes ___No

2. Why do you think that it is important (unimportant)?

   ___Many children do not learn how to read well in the regular classes

   ___Some children need special help to learn how to read

   ___The children should be taught how to read well in the regular classes

   ___The children are reading well enough without special classes

   ___Other (Specify) ____

   ____

3. (If yes to #1, ask:) What kinds of things do you think should be done in these special classes?

   ___The children should get individual help from a teacher

   ___Better (different) books should be used

   ___Children should practice more

   ___Special equipment (machines, etc.) should be used

   ___Other (Specify) ____

   ____

4. Do you know that your child is participating in a special reading laboratory class?

   ___Yes (Go to question 11)

   ___No (Continue with questinn 5)

5. Does your child ever tell you about the things that he (she) does in school?

___Yes, often (Continue with question 6)

___Yes, sometimes (Continue with question 6)

___Seldom (Continue with question 6)

___No (Go to question 7)

___Other (Specify) ____

____

6. What kinds of things does he (she) tell you?

___About his (her) teacher

___About his (her) friends

___About what he (she) does

___Other (Specify) ____

____

7. Have you met your child's teacher?

___Yes ___No

8. Have you been visited by a family assistant?

___Yes ___No

9. If your child had a reading problem, would you contact someone at the school for help?

___Yes

___Maybe

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

10. (If yes or maybe, ask:) Who would you contact at the school?

___The principal

___The teacher

___The family assistant

___The guidance counselor

___The reading program director

___Don't know

___Other (Specify who) ____

11. Is this the first year that your child has been in the special reading laboratory?

___Yes

___No

___Don't know

12. (If no, ask:) Do you think that these classes have helped your child to read better?

___Yes, very much

___Yes, some

___Not very much

___No, not at all

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____________________

13. Does your child ever tell you about these classes?

___Yes ___No

14. (If yes, ask:) What kinds of things does he (she) tell you about these classes?

___About his (her) teacher

___About the equipment that he (she) uses

___About the books and materials he (she) uses

___About the things he (she) does

___Other (Specify) ____________________

15. Has your child ever brought home any books or things that he (she) has made in these classes?

___Yes

___No

___Don't know

16. How do you think he (she) feels about these classes?

___Likes them very much

___Seems to like them better than other classes

___Indifferent

___Doesn't like them very much

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ______________________________

17. Have you been visited by a family assistant?

___Yes ___No

18. Have you met your child's teacher?

___Yes ___No

19. If your child had a reading problem, would you contact someone at school for help?

___Yes

___Maybe

___Don't know

___No (Go to question 21)

___Other (Specify ______________________________

20. (If yes or maybe, ask:) Who would you contact at the school?

___The principal

___A teacher

___The guidance counselor

___The family assistant

___The reading program director

___Other ______________________________

___Don't know

21. Why wouldn't you discuss your child's problem with anyone in the school?

___Don't know anyone in the school

___Don't think they would help

___Language difficulty

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

22. Do you know the program director?

___Yes ___No

23. (If yes, ask:) How would you rate him (her)?

___Very effective

___Effective

___O.K.

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

___Other (Specify)

24. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

25. What would you suggest to improve the program?

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals in the program

___More para-professionals in the program

___Better books and materials

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modifications) ______________________________

____

Name ______________ School, P.S. #__________

Sex _______(M/F)

Grade of child ______________ Sex of child __________(M/F)

Closed Circuit Television and Video Tape Recording Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARA-PROFESSIONALS

1. How long have you been employed as a para-professional (crewman)?

   ___1 - 3 months

   ___4 - 6 months

   ___7 - 9 months

   ___10 - 12 months

   ___More than one year

2. Did you work on the CCT & VTR program last summer?

   ___Yes ___No

3. (If yes, ask:) What school did you work in last summer?

   ___Same school

   ___Different school P.S. # ___________

4. What program did you work on last year? (Name of program) ___________

   ____

5. How much training did you have for this job before you actually began work?

   ___1. None

   ___One - two days

   ___Three - four days

   ___One week

   ___More than one week (Specify amount of training)___________

6. Was the training given in a

___Large group (More than 10 people)

___Small group (Less than 10 people)

___Individually

___Other (Specify type) ______________________

7. Who was your teacher for the training?

___Program director

___Other school personnel: Title ______________________

___Other (Specify) ______________________

8. How much "on the job" training did you have?

___None

___One session

___Two - three sessions

___Four - five sessions

___More than 5 sessions (Specify # of sessions) ______________

9. How much training is there for you while you are working in the program?

___None

___One hour per day

___Two hours per week

___Two hours per week

___More than 2 hours per week (Specify amount of time) ______________

10. Is the training given in a

___Large group (More than 10 people)

___Small group (Less than 10 people) or

___Individually

___Other (Specify type)

11. Who is your teacher for the training?

___Program director

___Other school personnel: Title ______________________________

___Other (Specify) ______________________________________

12. In which areas were you trained?

___Operation of monitor

___Operation of recording machine

___Operation of cameras

___Editing of films

___Other (Specify) ______________________________________

13. Do you think you have received enough training in the operation of the equipment?

___Yes ___No

14. Are additional training sessions planned for the future?

___Yes

___No

___Don't know

15. How many hours a week do you work?

___10 or less

___11 - 15

___16 - 20

___More than 20 (Specify number of hours) ____________

16. To whom are you directly responsible?

___Program director: Name ________________________________

___Classroom teacher: Name _______________________________

___Principal: Name ___________________________

___Don't know

___Other (Specify person) _______________________________

17. How would you rate the program director?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

___Don't know

___Other (specify) ______________________________

18. Why? (get specifics)______________________________

____

19. What is your relationship to the program director?

___Work closely with him (her)

___Receive direction and instruction from him (her)

___Have very little contact with him (her)

___Other (describe relationship)______________________________

____

20. From whom do you receive directives?

___Program director: name ______________________________

___Classroom teacher: name ______________________________

___Principal: name ______________________________

___No one

___Other (specify person)______________________________

21. Are you given ample time to follow directives?

___Yes

___No

___Sometimes

22. Explain: ______________________________

____

23. How would you rate the CCTV & VTR program at your school?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

___Don't know

___Other (specify)____

24. Why do you think that the program is (very effective, ineffective)? (Get specifics)

____

____

25. What would you suggest to improve the program? (Check more than one, if indicated).

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals

___More para-professionals employed in the program

___No suggestion, OK as is

___Other (specify modifications)______________________________

____

26. What is your attitude toward the school in general?

____

____

____

27. Has your attitude toward the school changed since you have been employed as a crewman?

___Yes

___No

___A little

___Don't know

___Other (describe) ____

28. (If yes, ask:) How has uour attitude changed?

___More favorable

___Less favorable

___More understanding of the school's problem

___More understanding of the lack of concern on the part of the school for the needs and interest of the children

___More understanding of the lack of relevance of the present educational matter for the children

___Other(describe)____

____

29. How well do you like what you are doing?

___Like very much

___Like somewhat

___Dislike somewhat

___Dislike greatly

___Other (specify) ______________________________

30. Do you feel that you are needed for what you are doing?

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Seldom

___No

___Other (specify) ______________________________

31. Does this work mean more to you than just a job?

___Yes

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not really

___No

___Other (specify) ______________________________

32. Why? (get specifics) ____

____

33. Would you like to work as a para-professional (crewman) in this program next year, if possible?

___Yes ___No

34. Why?

___Duties are rewarding

___Duties that are performed are not the same as those that were described when the job was accepted

___Salary (___adequate, ___inadequate)

___Number of hours per week (___too few, ___too many)

___Personality conflict

___Lack of clear direction from supervisor

___Other (describe reason)____

____

35. How did you hear about this job?

___A community organization meeting

___A newsletter from school

___A poster

___My child's teacher

___A friend

___Other (specify how or from whom)______________________________

36. Who actually hired you?

___A community organization representative

___Title I Coordinator

___Program director

___Principal

___Other (specify whom) ____

37. Do you live nearby?

___Yes ___No

38. What is your age bracket?

___less than 20

___20 - 29

___30 - 39

___40 - 49

___50 or over

39. What is the highest grade that you have completed in school?

___Elementary

___9th grade

___10th grade

___11th grade

___12th grade

___1 - 2 years of college

___Other (specify number of years or type of school)____________________

____

Name ________________________________ School, P.S.#_____________

Sex _____(M/F)

Closed Circuit Television and Video Tape Recording Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS THAT WERE TAPED

1. How were you selected to make a tape (s)?

   ___I volunteered

   ___I was assigned

   ___Don't know

   ___Other (Specify) ____

   ____

2. (If assigned ask:) By whom were you assigned?

   ___Program Director

   ___Principal

   ___Department Chairman

   ___Other (Specify) ______________________________

3. How was the subject matter for the tape selected?

   ___I was informed by (______________________________) that I was to
   Name, Title
   tape in the ___________________________area

   ___I chose my own area

   ___I don't know

   ___Other (Specify)

4. Was this the first tape that you made?

   ___Yes ___No

5. (If no, ask:) How many tapes did you make before?

   ___(Number)

6. Please list the specific areas:

   ____

   ____

7. Did you attend any training sessions before your taping?

___Yes

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

8. (If yes, ask:) How many training sessions have you attended?

___1 - 2 Sessions

___3 - 4 Sessions

___5 Sessions

___More than five sessions (Specify number _____)

9. How many people were in each of the training sessions?

___Individual sessions

___2 to 9

___10 or more

10. Who did the training?

___Program Director

___Other school personnel ____________________________________
Name, Title

___Other (Specify) ____

11. Did you find the sessions helpful in making this tape?

___Yes

___No

___Other

12. Why? Explain: ____

____

13. Was the lesson that you taped taught by you in a class prior to taping?

___Yes ___No

14. How would you rate the CCTV & VTR program overall?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion

15. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

16. Are there any aspects of the CCTV & VTR program that you feel have not been implemented?

___Yes ___No

17. (If yes, ask:) What are they? ________________________________

____

____

18. Are there any external factors that you feel may be having a detrimental effect on the program?

___Yes ___No

19. (If yes, ask:) What are they? ________________________________

____

____

20. What would you suggest to improve the program? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Expand the program

___More training for para-professionals

___Establish criteria for defining a "good teaching" tape and a "poor teaching" tape

___Have more planning sessions

___Have better organization

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modification) ______________________________

____

21. Are you aware of any effects, positive or negative, that the CCTV & VTR program has had on the rest of the school?

__Yes   __No

22. Please discuss: ____

23. Do you wish to see this program funded for another year?

__Yes   __No

24. Why? (Give specifics) __________________________________

Name __________________________ Sex _____(M/F)

School ______________ Age _____

New York City teaching licenses held:

A. Regular licenses in the following subjects: ________________

B. Substitute licenses in the following subjects: ________________

C. Ancillary licenses: ____________________________

D. The subject (s) I am presently teaching is (are): ____________

E. Grade level (s) ____________________

F. Number of years of teaching experience: ________

Closed Circuit Television and Video Tape Recording Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS WHO HAVE SEEN TAPES

1. How many video tapings have you seen?

___None (If none, end interview here)

___1 - 2

___3 - 4

___5 or more (Specify number ______)

2. Which ones have you seen?

(List by title:)	(Approximate) Date Seen
1. ______________________________	________________________
2. ______________________________	________________________
3. ______________________________	________________________
4. ______________________________	________________________
5. ______________________________	________________________

3. Have you attended teacher training sessions related to CCTV?

___Yes ___No

4. (If yes, ask:) How many teacher training sessions have you attended?

___One - two sessions

___Three - four sessions

___Five sessions or more (Specify number ______)

5. How have these sessions helped you? (Explain how they have helped)

____

____

6. Have you used closed circuit television in your classroom?

___Yes ___No

7. (If yes, ask:) For which subject area (s) have you used closed circuit television in your classroom?

____

____

____

8. What do you think the class got out of it? Explain

____

____

____

9. To what extent was the CCTV able to hold the class's interest?

___Always

___Usually

___Rarely

___Never

___Most of the students

___About ½ of the students

___Few of the students

___None of the students

10. Have the students expressed a desire for more programs of this type?

___Yes

___No

___Don't know

11. How would you rate the CCTV and VTR programs overall?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion

12. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

13. Are there any aspects of the CCTV and VTR program that you feel have not been implemented?

___Yes

___No

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

____

14. (If yes, ask;) What are they? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

15. Are there any external factors that you feel may be having a detrimentsl effect on the program?

___Yes

___No

___Don't know

___Other (Specify factors) ______________________________

____

16. (If yes, ask:) What are they? (Get specifics)

____

____

17. What would you suggest to improve the program? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___More training for para-professionals

___Establish criteria for defining a "good teaching" tape and a "poor teaching " tape

___Have more planning sessions

___Have better organization

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modifications) ______________________________

____

18. Are you aware of any effects positive or negative, that the CCTV and VTR program has had on the rest of the school?

___Yes ___No

Please describe: ______________________________

____

____

____

19. Do you wish to see this program funded for another year?

___Yes ___No

20. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

Name ______________________________ Sex _____(M/F)

School ______________ Age ________

New York City teaching licenses held:

A. Regular licenses in the following subjects: ______________

____

B. Substitute licenses in the following subjects: ______________

____

C. Ancillary licenses: ______________________________

____

D. The subject (s) I am presently teaching is (are): ______________

____

E. Grade level (s) ______________

F. Number of years of teaching experience: __________

Cultural Heritage Implementation Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

1. Is this the first year that your class has participated in CHIP?

   ___Yes ___No

2. (If no, ask:) Do you think that the program has changed?

   ___Yes ___No

3. (If Yes, ask:) How do you think it has changed? (Check more than one if indicated)

   ___Better organized

   ___Better curriculum

   ___Children more responsive

   ___New teachers

   ___Less organized

   ___No clear curriculum

   ___Children less responsive

   ___Other (Specify changes) ____

   ____

4. How would you rate CHIP overall?

   ___Excellent

   ___Good

   ___Fair

   ___Poor

5. Why? (Get specifics) ____

   ____

6. How would you rate the children's reaction to CHIP theatrical presentations?

___Very enthusiastic

___Enthusiastic

___Fair

___Not interested

___Don't know

___Other (Specify reaction) ____________________

____

7. (If enthusiastic or very enthusiastic, ask:) Do you think that this enthusiasm is carried over into the CHIP class sessions?

___Yes

___No

___Sometimes

8. How would you rate the children's reaction to CHIP classes as compared to regular academic classes?

___More responsive

___About the same

___Less responsive

___No opinion

___Don't know

___Other (Specify reaction) ____________________

____

9. Have you been able to incorporate any of the material presented to the children by CHIP in other classes?

___Yes

___No

___Sometimes

10. (If yes, or sometimes, ask:) How have you been able to incorporate the material?

___Compositions

___Class discussions

___Debates

___Reading

___Library research

___Other (Specify) ____

____

11. Did you have any orientation or planning sessions prior to participation in CHIP?

___Yes ___No

12. (If yes, ask:) How much?

___One - two days

___Three - four days

___Five days

___More than five days (Specify number of days) _____

13. (If yes, to question 11, ask:) What kind of orientation or planning sessions did you have?

___Individual (With CHIP teachers)

___Small group (Other classroom teachers and CHIP teachers)

___Large group (Class)

___Individual (With program director)

___Small group (With other classroom teachers and program director)

___Other (Describe) ____

____

14. Have you attended any planning sessions since the program has been in operation?

___Yes ___No

15. (If yes, ask:) How many?

___One

___Two

___Three

___More than three, (Specify #____)

16. Do you have a CHIP para-professional assigned to your class?

___Yes

___No

17. (If yes, ask:) What are her (his) Duties and responsibilities? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Works directly with children

___Assists the teacher with records and paper work

___Assists the teacher with collection of material and planning of lessons

___None of the above

___Other (Describe responsibilities) ________________________________

____

18. To whom is the para-professional responsible?

___ CHIP teacher

___Classroom teacher

___Don't know

___Other (Specify person) ________________________

19. What is your relationship to the CHIP teacher?

___Work closely with him (her)

___Receive material and suggestions from him (her)

___Have very little contact with him (her)

___Other (Describe relationship) ________________________________

____

20. Do you know the program director?

___Yes, very well

___Yes, slightly

___No

21. How would you rate the program director?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

22. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

____

23. What do you think should be the qualifications of the teachers of CHIP classes? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Black

___White

___Puerto Rican (or Spanish-speaking)

___Experienced, licenses teacher

___Expert in the filed, not necessarily an experienced, licensed teacher

___Other (Describe qualifications) ______________________

____

24. What would you suggest to improve the program? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Expand the program

___Hire more experienced teachers

___Develop better curriculum

___Have more planning sessions

___Obtain more and better material

___Have better organization

___Hire more para-professionals

___No suggestions, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modifications) ______________________

____

25. How was your class selected to participate in the CHIP program?

___Volunteered

___Requested by principal

___Requested by program director

___Requested by Title I coordinator

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

26. Would you like your class to participate in CHIP next year if possible?

___Yes ___No

27. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

Name ______________________________ Sex _____(M/F)

School ____________________ Age _______

New York City teaching licenses held:

A. Regular licenses in the following subjects: ____________________

____

B. Substitute licenses in the following subjects: ____________________

____

C. Ancillary licenses: ______________________________

____

D. The subject (s) I am presently teaching is (are): ____________________

____

E. Grade level (s): ____________

F. Total number of years of teaching experience: ____________

Cultural Heritage Implementation Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR CHIP TEACHERS

1. Is this the first year that you have taught CHIP classes?

___Yes ___No

2. (If no, ask:) Do you think that the program has changed?

___Yes ___No

3. How do you think the program has changed? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Better organized

___Better curriculum

___Children more responsive

___New teachers

___Less organized

___No clear curriculum

___Other (Specify changes) ______________________________

____

4. How would you rate CHIP overall?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion

5. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

____

6. How would you rate the children's reaction to CHIP theatrical presentation?

___Very enthusiastic

___Enthusiastic

___Fair

___Not interested

___Other (Specify reaction) ______________________________

7. (If enthusiastic or very enthusiastic, ask:) Do you think that this enthusiasm is carried over into CHIP class sessions?

___Yes

___No

___Sometimes

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

8. How would you rate the children's reaction to CHIP classes as compared to regular academic classes?

___More responsive

___About the same

___Less responsive

___No opinion

___Other (Specify reaction) ______________________________

9. Do you have a curriculum plan for your classes?

___Yes

___No

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

10. (If yes, ask:) How did you obtain this curriculum?

___Was developed by the program director

___Was adopted from another cultural heritage program

___Developed by self for this program

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

____

11. What kinds of material do you use in your classes?

___Books

___Objects from the childrens' environment

___Special commercially developed material

___Personally created material

___All of the above

___Other (Specify) ________________________________

12. Have you ever taught a cultural heritage program other than CHIP?

___Yes ___No

13. (If yes, ask:) Where?

___Name of school or organization ________________________

___Name of program ________________________________

14. How long did you teach this program?

___1 Year

___2 Years

___More than 2 years (Specify number of years) ________

15. Did you have any orientation or planning sessions prior to beginning to teach CHIP classes?

___Yes ___No

16. (If yes, ask:) How much?

___One day

___Two days

___One week

___More than one week (Specify number of days) _____

17. (If yes, to #15, ask:) With whom did you have these orientation or planning sessions?

___Program Director

___Other CHIP teachers

___Classroom teachers

___College or university personnel (Name of college or University ______________________________

___All of the above

___Other (Specify person) ______________________________

18. Have you attended any planning sessions since you have begun to teach CHIP classes?

___Yes ___No

19. (If yes, ask:) How many?

___One

___Two

___Three

___More than three (Specify number) __________

20. With whom did you have these planning sessions?

___Program Director

___Other CHIP teachers

___Classroom teachers

___College or university personnel (Name of college or university ______________________________)

___All of the above

___Other (Specify person) ______________________________

21. Do you have a CHIP para-professional assigned to your classes?

___Yes ___No

22. (If yes, ask:) What are his (her) duties and responsibilities? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Works directly with children

___Assists the teacher with records and paper work

___Assists the teacher with collection of material and planning of sessions

___None of the above

___Other (Describe responsibilities) ____________________

____

23. To whom is the para-professional responsible?

___CHIP teacher

___Classroom teacher

___Program Director

___Don't know

___Other (Specify person) ____________________

24. What is your relationship to the classroom teacher?

___Work closely with him (her)

___Give material and suggestions to him (her)

___Have little contact with him (her)

___Other (Describe relationship) ____________________

____

25. What is your relationship to the program director?

___Work closely with him (her)

___Receive material and suggestions from him (her)

___Have little contact with him (her)

___Other (Specify relationship) ____________________

____

26. How would you rate the program director?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective
___Very ineffective
___Other (Specify) ______________________________

27. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

28. What do you think should be the qualifications of the teachers of CHIP classes? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Black

___White

___Puerto Rican (or Spanish-speaking)

___Experienced, licensed teacher

___Expert in the field, not necessarily an experienced, licensed teacher

___Other (Describe qualifications) ______________________________

29. What would you suggest to improve the program? (Check more than one, if indicated)
___Expand the program

___Hire more experienced teachers

___Develop better curriculum

___Have more planning sessions

___Obtain more and better material

___Have better organization

___Hire more para-professionals

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modifications) ______________________________

____

B43

Name ______________________________________ Sex ____ (M/F)

School ________________ Age ______

New York City teaching licenses held:

A. Regular licenses in the following subjects: ____________________

____

B. Substitute licenses in the following subjects: ________________

____

C. Ancillary licenses: ____

D. The subject (s) I am presently teaching is (are): _____________

____

E. Grade level: __________________

F. Total number of years of teaching experience: ________

Cultural Heritage Implementation Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHER AIDES

1. How long have you been employed as a teacher aid?

   ___One year or less

   ___One - two years

   ___Two years or more (Specify number of years) _______

2. (If more than one year ,ask:) Did you work on the CHIP program last year?

   ___Yes ___No

3. (If no, ask:) What school did you work in last year?

   ___Same school

   ___Different school, P.S. # ______

4. What program did you work on last year? Name of program __________________

   ____

5. How much training did you have for this job before you actually began work?

   ___None

   ___One - two days

   ___Three - four days

   ___One week

   ___More than one week (Specify amount of training) ____________________

6. Was the training given in a

   ___Large group (More than 10 people)

   ___Small group (Less than 10 people) or

   ___Individually

   ___Other (Specify type) ____

7. Who was your teacher for the training?

___CHIP teacher

___Classroom teacher

___Other school personnel: Title _______________________________________

___A college or university: ____________________________________Name

___An anti-poverty agency: Name ________________________________

___Other (Specify) ____

8. How much training is there for you while you are working in the program?

___None

___One hour per day

___One hour per week

___Two hours per week

___More than 2 hrs. per week (Specify amount of time) __________

9. Is the training given in a

___Large group (More than 10 people)

___Small group (Less than 10 people)

___Individually

___Other (Specify type)

10. Who is your teacher?

___CHIP teacher

___Classroom teacher

___Other school personnel: Title _______________________________________

___A college or university: Name _______________________________________

___An anti-poverty agency: Name ____

___Other (Specify) ____

11. How many hours a week do you work?

___10 or less

___11 - 15

___16 - 20

___More than 20 (Specify number of hours) ________

12. How well do you like what you are doing?

___Like very much

___Like somewhat

___Dislike somewhat

___Dislike greatly

___Other (Specify) ____

____

13. What are your duties and responsiblities? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Work directly with the children

___Assist the teacher with records and paper work

___Assist the teacher with collection of material and planning lessons

___None of the above

___Other (Specify duties) ______________________________________

____

14. Do you feel that you are needed for what you are doing?

___Yes

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Seldom

___No

___Other (Describe) ____

____

15. Does this work mean more to you than just a job?

___Yes

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not really

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

16. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

17. To whom are you responsible?

___CHIP teacher

___Classroom teacher

___Program director

___Don't know

___Other (Specify title) ______________________________

18. Do you know the program director?

___Yes ___No

19. (If yes, ask:) How would you rate the program director?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

20. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

21. What is your relationship to the CHIP teacher?

___Work closely with him (her)

___Receive direction and instruction from him (her)

___Have very little contact with him (her)

___Other (Describe relationship)______________________________

____

22. What is your relationship to the classroom teacher?

___Work closely with him (her)

___Receive direction and instruction from him (her)

___Have very little contact with him (her)

___Other (Describe relationship) ____________________________

____

23. What is your attitude toward the school in general?

____

____

____

24. Has your attitude toward the school changed since you have been employed as a teachers' aide?

___Yes

___No

___Somewhat

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ______________________________________

____

25. (If yes, ask:) How has your opinion changed?

___More favorable

___Less favorable

___More understanding of the problems faced by the school

___More understanding of the lack of concern on the part of the school for the needs and interests of the children

___More understanding of the lack of relevance of the present educational matter for the children

___Other (Describe) ______________________________

____

____

26. How would you rate the program overall?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___ No opinion

___Other (Describe) ______________________________

____

27. Why do you think that the program is (very effective, fair, or poor)?

___Has real meaning for the children

___Stimulates the children's interest in reading and other school work

___The idea of the program is good, but it needs better organization

___The program needs more personnel

___The program does not capture the interest of the children

___The program is disorganized

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

____

____

28. How well do you think the children like the program?

___Very much

___O.K.

___Not very much

___No opinion, don't know

___Other (Specify)

29. What would you suggest to improve the program?(Check more than one, if indicated)

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals employed in the program

___More para-professionals employed in the program

___Better books and materials

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modifications) ____

____

30. What do you think should be the qualifications of a CHIP teacher? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Black

___White

___Puerto Rican (or Spanish-speaking)

___Experienced, licensed teacher

___Expert in the field, not necessarily an experienced, licensed teacher

___Other (Specify qualifications) ____

____

31. Would you like to be a teachers' aide in this program next year?

___Yes ___No

32. Why?

___Duties are rewarding

___Duties that are performed are not the same as those that were described when the job was accepted

___Salary (___adequate, inadequate ___)

___Number of hours per week (___too few, ___too many)

___Personality conflict

___Lack of clear direction from teacher (s)

___Other (Describe reason) ____

____

33. How did you hear about your job?

___A community organization meeting

___A newsletter from the school

___A poster

___My child's teacher

___A friend

___Other (Specify how or from whom) ______________________________

34. Who actually hired you?

___A community agency representative

___Title I coordinator

___Program director

___Principal

___Other (Specify whom) ____

35. Do you live nearby?

___Yes ___No

36. What is the highest grade that you have completed in school?

___Elementary school

___9th grade

___10th grade

___11th grade

___12th grade

___1 - 2 years of college

___Other (Specify number of years or type of school) ____________________

____

37. What is your age bracket?

___Less than 20

___20 - 29

___30 - 39

___40 - 49

___50 or over

Name ___________________________________ School, P.S. # _____

Sex _____(M/F)

Cultural Heritage Implementation Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARENTS

1. Do you think that it is important for the schools to teach African culture, Afro-American heritage, and Antillean culture classes?

___Yes ___No

2. Why do you think that it is (important, unimportant)?

___To teach the children that their ancestors have made important contributions to our culture

___To help the children feel that they ar an important part of our society

___To present an accurate picture of the history and growth of our society

___Porgram is not necessary

___Children should concentrate on academic studies

___Other (Specify) ________________________________

____

3. What kinds of things do you think should be taught in these classes?

___History

___Geography

___About famous people

___How different people live

___Other (Specify content) __________________________

____

____

4. Do you know that your child is attending cultural heritage classes?

___Yes (Go to question 8)

___No (Continue with question 5)

5. Does your child ever tell you about the things that he (she) does in school?

___Yes, often (Continue with question 6)

___Yes, sometimes (Continue with question 6)

___Seldom (Continue with question 6)

___No (Go to question 7)

___Other (Specify) ____

6. What kinds of things does he (she) tell you?

___About his (her) teacher

___About his (her) friends

___About what he (she) does

___Other (Describe) ____

____

7. Have you met your child's teacher?

___Yes ___No

8. Is this the first year that your child has been in CHIP classes?

___Yes ___No

9. (If no, ask:) Did he (she) have the same teacher last year as this year?

___Yes ___No

10. Does your child ever tell you about these classes?

___Yes ___No

11. (If yes, ask:) What kinds of things does he (she) tell you?

___About his (her) teacher

___About the books and materials that he (she) uses

___About the things that he (she) learns

___Other (Specify) ____

____

12. (If yes to # 10, ask:) How do you think he (she) feels about these classes?

___Likes them very much

___Seems to like them better than other classes

___Indifferent

___Doesn't like them very much

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ____________________

____

13. Has your child ever brought home any books or things that he (she) has made in these classes?

___Yes ___No

14. Have you ever been asked to make things or help in any way in these classes?

___Yes ___No

15. (If yes, ask:) How (Get specifics) ____________________

____

____

16. Do you know that your child attends special theatrical presentations concerning cultural heritage?

___Yes ___No

17. (If yes, ask:) Does your child ever tell you about these presentations?

___Yes ___No

18. (If yes, ask:) How do you think he (she) feels about them?

___Likes them very much

___Seems to like them better than other special assemblies

___Indifferent

___Doesn't like them very much

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ____________________

____

19. Do you know the CHIP director?

___Yes ___No

20. (If yes, ask:) How would you rate him (her)?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

___Other (Specify)

22. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

23. What do you think should be the qualifications for a CHIP teacher? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Black

___White

___Puerto Rican (or Spanish-speaking)

___Experienced, licensed teacher

___Expert in the field, not necessarily experienced, licensed teacher

___Other (Specify qualifications) ________________________________

____

24. What would you suggest to improve the program? (Check more than one, if indicated

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals in the program

___More para-professionals in the program

___Better books and materials

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modification) __________________________________

____

B57

Name ______________________________ School, P.S. #_________

Sex _____(M/F)

Grade of Child _______________ Sex of Child __________________

Cultural Heritage Implementation Program

INTERVIEW OF CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR CHILDREN IN CHIP PROGRAM

1. What is CHIP?

   ___Art and music classes

   ___A place to visit on class trips

   ___Cultural heritage classes

   ___Other ______________________________

2. What three places have you learned about in CHIP classes?

   ___Japan

   ___Africa

   ___Russia

   ___The United States

   ___France

   ___The Caribbean

   ___Other (Specify) ______________________________

3. Do you like CHIP classes?

   ___Yes

   ___No

   ___Don't know

4. Have you learned many new things in CHIP classes?

   ___Yes

   ___No

   ___Don't know

5. What do you like about CHIP?

   ____

6. Which of these countries are in Africa?

	Yes	No	Don't know
___Ghana	___	___	___
___Great Britain	___	___	___
___Nigeria	___	___	___
___France	___	___	___
___Portugal	___	___	___
___Egypt	___	___	___

7. How many different African languages are there?

___1 - 24

___25 - 50

___More than 50

8. What are the Antillies?

___Countries in Europe

___Islands in the West Indies

___Islands in the Mediterrean

___Other (Specify) ____

9. Most Black people came to America because

___They wanted to

___They were forced to

___By accident

___Other ____

10. Which of the following places are in the Antilles?

	Yes	No	Don't know
___ Haiti	___	___	___
New York	___	___	___
California	___	___	___
Puerto Rico	___	___	___
Bermuda	___	___	___
Trinidad	___	___	___

11. How many territories are there in Africa?

___1 - 24

___25 - 49

___50 - 75

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

12. Did any Black people take part in the pioneering days of the West?

___Yes

___No

___Don't know

13. Most of the people of Puerto Rico live in

___Large cities

___On farms

___In small towns

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

14. Is Africa a

___Continent

___Country

___City

___Don't know

___Other (Specify)

15. Who was Martin Luther King?

___Poet

___A non-violent leader

___An athlete

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

16. Which river is in Africa?

___The Amazon

___The Nile

___The Mississippi

___Don't know

___Other (Specify)

17. Who was Nat Turner?

___Poet

___Scientist

___Leader of a slave revolt

___Don't know

___Other (Specify)

18. What kinds of people lived in the Antilles a long time ago?

	Yes	No	aDon't know
Indians, Europeans, Africans	___	___	___
Russians, Chinese, Americans	___	___	___
English, Russians, Japanese	___	___	___

Other ____

19. Were Black people the only people who were slaves in the United States?

___Yes

___No

___Don't know

Grade __________ School, P.S. # _________ Sex_____(M/F)

Motivation for Learning Program

CLASSROOM TEACHERS' SCALE FOR RATING CHILDREN

Circle the appropriate number corresponding to the most adequate, appropriate description of the child using the code below:

CODE: 1. Always 2. Usually 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

1. Quiet, shy, not very talkative/verbally expressive 1 2 3 4 5
2. Reserved, moderately talkative/verbally expressive 1 2 3 4 5
3. Agressive, bold, talkative/very expressive 1 2 3 4 5
4. Acts out (negative, defensively) excessively and "inappropriately" talkative 1 2 3 4 5
5. Follows school routine/orders and demands 1 2 3 4 5
6. Follows school routine/orders and demands with pleasure 1 2 3 4 5
7. Follows school routine/orders and demands begrudgingly, hostile 1 2 3 4 5
8. Follows school routine/orders and demands, but, restless and bored by it 1 2 3 4 5
9. Original in thinking and ways of expressing self 1 2 3 4 5
10. Imaginative in style and forms of communication 1 2 3 4 5
11. Conforming "acceptable" self-expression and communication 1 2 3 4 5
12. Gets along well with other children i.e. popular 1 2 3 4 5
13. Gets along well with teacher (s) 1 2 3 4 5
14. Generally stays by himself (herself) 1 2 3 4 5
15. Has a keen sense of humor 1 2 3 4 5
16. Generally acts inhibited with respect to his (her) own expression of fun and pleasure 1 2 3 4 5
17. Behaves flexibly, yielding, giving-in character 1 2 3 4 5

18. Appears sensitive, aware of self, others, school, tasks 1 2 3 4 5

19. Appears to be interested in physical sciences, arithmetic,etc. 1 2 3 4 5

20. Appears to be interested in reading, writing spelling, words and work-tasks, etc. 1 2 3 4 5

21. Appears to be interested in art, music, simple verse, etc. 1 2 3 4 5

22. Appears to be interested in games, sports, etc. 1 2 3 4 5

****

Below, place a check in the column which approximately, adequately, describes the child's scores on a:

	Relatively High Top 1/3 of Class	Average Middle of Class	Low Bottom of Class
24. School-wide achievement test (s)			
25. Classroom tests/quiz			
26. Classroom oral quiz			
27. Graded homework assignments			

****

Simply check below if children appear to be having some difficulty in any of the following areas:

28. ___Picking up small objects

29. ___Manual dexterity for "self-help" e.g. tying shoe laces

30. ___Coloring

31. ___Cutting

32. ___Writing and tracing

33. ___Matching shapes

34. ___Distinguishing figure and ground

35. ___Copying circles, squares, diamond shapes, etc.

36. ___Observing likenesses and differences

37. ___Recognizing objects in different colors, positions, etc.

38. ___Transferring from vertical to horizontal (copying from the board)

39. ___Distinguishing sounds

40. ___Reproducing sounds

41. ___Association of sounds with letter names and written letters

****

Simply check yes, no, or don't know to the following:

42. Does child wear glasses?

___Yes ___No ___Don't know

43. Does child appear (to you) to have a visual handicap?

___Yes ___No ___Don't know

44. Does child appear (to you) to have an auditory handicap?

___Yes ___No ___Don't know

45. Does child appear (to you) to have a speech handicap?

___Yes ___No ___Don't know

46. Does child appear (to you) to have a motor handicap?

___Yes ___No ___Don't know

47. Does child have any "medical" difficulty that you know of?

___Yes ___No ___Don't know

Name of child ________________________ School, P.S. #__________

Grade of Child __________________ Sex of child ____(M/F)

Motivation for Learning Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS

1. Is this the first experience that you have had with using a "rating scale" to refer children for special guidance?

___Yes

___No

___Other (Describe) ____

____

2. Did you have any orientation or planning sessions prior to using the scale?

___Yes (Continue with question # 3)

___No (Go to question # 6)

3. How much?

___One - two days

___Three - four days

___5 days

___More than 5 days (Specify number of days) ____

4. What kind of orientation or planning sessions did you have?

___Individual (with guidance counselor)

___Small group (Other teachers and guidance counselor)

___Large group (with guidance counselor)

___Other (Describe) ____

____

5. Do you think that the orientation or planning sessions were adequate to enable you to rate the children appropriately?

___Yes

___No

___Other (Describe) ____

____

6. Do you think that you have adequate knowledge to rate the children appropriately without having any orientation or planning sessions prior to using the scale?

___Yes

___No

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

____

7. Have you attended any planning sessions since you have "rated" the children?

___Yes ___No

8. (If yes, ask:) How many?

___One ___Three

___Two ___More than three,(Specify #____)

9. Do you think that these planning sessions have helped you to better identify children who need special guidance?

___Yes ___No

10. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

11. Do you know the guidance counselor?

___Yes ___No

12. (If yes, ask:) How would you rate the guidance counselor?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

13. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

14. What is your relationship to the guidance counselor?

___Work closely with her

___Receive material and suggestions from her

___Have very little contact with her

___Other (Describe relationship) ____

____

15. How would you rate the program overall?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion

16. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

17. What would you suggest to improve the program? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Expand the program

___Have more planning sessions

___Obtain more and better material

___Hire more para-professionals

___Have better organization

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modifications) ____

____

18. Would you like to have this program available to your students next year if possible?

___Yes ___No

19. Why? (Get specifics) ____________________

Name ____________________ Sex ____(M/F)

School ______________ Age ____

New York City teaching licenses held:

A. Regular licenses in the following subjects: ____________________

B. Substitute licenses in the following subjects: ____________________

C. Ancillary licenses: ____________________

D. The subject (s) I am presently teaching is (are): ____________________

E. Grade level (s) ____________________

Motivation for Learning Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARENTS

1. Do you think that it is important for the schools to have a guidance program for the students?

   ___Yes ___No

2. Why do you think that it is (important, unimportant)?

   ___To help the children adjust to the school environment

   ___To help the children "do better" in their school work

   ___Some children need special guidance in order to adjust to the school environment

   ___Program is not necessary

   ___Children should concentrate on academic studies

   ___Other (Specify) ____

3. Do you know that your child is attending guidance sessions?

   ___Yes (Go to question 11)

   ___No (Continue with question 4)

4. Does your child tell you about the things that he (she) does in school?

   ___Yes, often (Continue with question 5)

   ___Yes, sometimes (Continue with question 5)

   ___Seldom (Continue with question 5)

   ___No (Go to question 7)

   ___Other (Specify) ____

5. What kinds of things does he (she) tell you?

   ___About his (her) teacher

   ___About his (her) friends

   ___About what he (she) does

   ___Other (Specify) ____

   ____

6. Have you met your child's teacher?

___Yes ___No

7. If your child was having a problem in school, would you contact someone in the school concerning it?

___Yes

___Maybe

___No

___Don't know

___Other (Specify)________________________________

8. (If yes or maybe, ask:) Who would you contact?

___The guidance counselor

___The teacher

___The principal

___The family assistant

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ________________________________

9. (If no to # 7, ask:) Why not?

___Don't know anyone at the school

___Don't think that they would help

___Language difficulty

___Other (Specify) ________________________________

10. Have you been visited by a family assistant?

___Yes ___No

11. Does your child ever tell you about these guidance sessions?

__Yes __No

12. (If yes, ask:) What kinds of things does he (she) tell you about them?

__About the guidance counselor

__About the educational assistant

__About the games and materials that he (she) uses

__About the things that he (she) does

__Other (Specify) ____

____

13. (If yes to # 12, ask:) How do you think he (she) feels about these sessions?

__Likes them very much

__Seems to like them better than his (her) regular school classes

__Indifferent

__Doesn't like them very much

__Don't know

__Other (Specify) ____

14. Has your child ever brought home any things that he (she) has done in these sessions?

__Yes __No

15. Do you think that these guidance sessions are helping your child to adjust better to the school?

__Yes

__No

__Don't know

__Other (Specify) ____

16. Do you know the guidance counselor?

__Yes __No

17. (If yes, ask:) How would you rate the guidance counselor?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

18. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

19. Have you been visited by a family assistant?

___Yes ___No

20. If your child was having a problem in school would you contact someone at the school concerning it?

___Yes ___No

21. (If yes, ask:) Who would you contact?

___The guidance counselor

___The teacher

___The principal

___The family assistant

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

22. (If no to # 20, ask:) Why not?

___Don't know anyone at the school

___Don't think that they would help

___Language difficulty

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

23. What would you suggest to improve the program?

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals

___More para-professionals in the program

___Better materials

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modifications)________________________________

____

Name ______________________________ School, P.S. # ______________

Sex _______(M/F)

Grade of child ______________________ Sex of child _______(M/F)

Motivation for Learning Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR FAMILY ASSISTANTS

1. How long have you been employed as a family assistant?

___One year or less

___More than one year but less than two

___Two years or more (Specify number of years) ______

2. (If more than one year, ask:) What school did you work in last year?

___Same school

___Different school, P.S. # _______

3. What program did you work on last year? (Specify name of program) __________

____

4. How much training did you have for this job before you actually began work?

___None

___One - two days

___Three - four days

___One week

___More than one week (Specify amount of training) ______________________

5. Was the training given in a

___Large group (More than 10 people)

___Small group (Less than 10 people) or

___Individually

___Other (Specify type) ____

6. Who was your teacher for the training?

___Guidance counselor

___Classroom teacher

___Other school personnel: Title ____________________

___A college or university: ____________________Name

___An anti-poverty agency? ____________________Name

___Other (Specify) ____________________

7. How much training is there for you while you are working in the program?

___None

___One hour per day

___One hour per week

___Two hours per week

___More than 2 hours per week (Specify amount of time) ____________

8. Is the training given in a

___Large group (More than 10 people)

___Small group (Less than 10 people) or

___Individually

___Other (Specify type) ____________________

9. Who is your teacher?

___Guidance counselor

___Classroom teacher

___Other school personnel: Title ____________________

___A college or university: Name ____________________

___An anti-poverty agency: Name ____________________

___Other (Specify) ____________________

10. How many hours a week do you work?

___10 or less

___11 - 15

___16 - 20

___More than 20 (Specify number of hours) ________

11. How well do you like what you are doing?

___Like very much

___Like somewhat

___Dislike somewhat

___Dislike greatly

___Other (Specify) ____

12. What are your duties and responsibilities? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Helping guidance counselor and/or teacher with records and paper work

___Helping guidance counselor and teacher with students

___Assisting the guidance counselor and/or teacher with collection of material and planning work

___Custodian of children out of class

___Visiting parents in the home

___None of the above

___Other (Specify) ____

13. (If the answer is, visit parents in their homes, ask:) How many parents have you visited?

___5 - 10

___11 - 20

___21 - 30

___More than 30 (Specify number, approx. _____)

14. What has been the general response of the parents that you have visited?

___Hostile

___Apathetic

___Friendly

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ____

15. How often do you plan to visit with parents?

___Three times a week

___At least twice a week

___Once a week

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

16. What do you talk about when you visit with the parents?

___Their children and the program and how they can help their children

___The school

___Family problems

___General conversation

___Other (Describe) ____

____

17. How do you decide what to talk about when you visit with the parents?

___The guidance counselor gives me suggestions

___The teacher gives me suggestions

___I decide myself

___The parents and I decide what is important for the student and the program

___Other (Specify) ____

____

18. Do you feel that you are needed for what you are doing?

___Yes, very much

___Yes, most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not much

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

19. Does this work mean more to you than just a job?

___Yes, almost always

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not really

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

20. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

21. To whom are you responsible?

___Guidance counselor

___Classroom teacher

___Don't know

___Other (Specify title) ___________________________________

22. How would you rate the guidance counselor?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective
___Very ineffective
___Don't know
___Other (Specify) ____

23. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

24. What is your relationship to the guidance counselor?

___Work closely with her

___Receive direction and instruction from her

___Have very little contact with her

___Other (Describe relationship) ____

____

25. How often do you tell the guidance counselor what occurs after you visit with the parents?

___Always

___Usually

___Rarely

___Never

___Other ____

26. What does the guidance counselor do after you report?

___Discusses the problems with you and suggests ways to help the student

___Makes suggestions

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

____

27. What is your relationship to the classroom teachers?

___Work closely with them

___Receive direction and instruction from them

___Have very little contact with them

___Other (Describe relationship) ____

____

28. Do you feel that the work you are doing is important?

___Yes, very important

___Yes, most of the time

___Sometimes

___No, not very

___No, not at all

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

29. How or why do you think that it is important? (Get specifics) __________

____

30. Do you feel that you are an important part of the "team" working with the children?

___Yes, very much an important part

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not really

___No

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

31. Do you feel that you need more help in order to accomplish the requirements of your job?

___Yes, definitely

___I think so

___I don't know

___No

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

32. (If yes, ask:) What kind of help do you think that you need?

___Assistance from the guidance counselor and teacher

___Assistance from the parents of the children

___Cooperation from the children

___More (better) equipment and materials

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

____

33. Do you feel that you are receiving the help that you require?

___Yes, definitely

___Yes, most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not regularly

___No

___Other (Specify) ________________________________

34. What is your attitude toward the school in general?

____

____

____

35. Has your attitude toward the school changed since you have been employed as a family assistant?

___Yes

___No

___Somewhat

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ________________________________

____

36. (If yes, ask:) How has your opinion changed?

___More favorable

___Less favorable

___More understanding of the problems faced by the school

___More understanding of the lack of concern on the part of the school for the needs and interests of the children

___Other (Describe) ________________________________

____

37. How would you rate the program overall?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ____

____

38. Why do you think that the program is (excellent,good, fair, or poor)?

___Is of real benefit to the children

___Helps the children adjust better to the school environment

___The idea of the program is good but, it needs better organization

___The program does not really help the children

___The program is disorganized

___Other (Specify) ____

____

39. How well do you think the children like the program?

___Very much

___O.K.

___Not very much

___No opinion, don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

40. What would you suggest to improve the program? (Check more than one,if indicate

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals employed in the program

___More para-professionals employed in the program

___Better materials

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify) ____

____

41. Would you like to be a family assistant in this program next year?

___Yes ___No

42. Why?

___Duties are rewarding

___Duties that are performed are not the same as those that were described when the job was accepted

___Salary (___adequate, ___inadequate)

___Number of hours per week (___too few, ___too many)

q ___Personality conflict

___Lack of clear direction from guidance counselor and/or teachers

___Other (Describe reason) ____

____

43. How did you hear about your job?

___A community organization meeting

___A newsletter from the school

___A poster

___My child's teacher

___A friend

___Other (Specify how or from whom) ______________________________

44. Who actually hired you?

___A community agency representative

___Title I coordinator

___Guidance Counselor

___Principal

___Other (Specify whom) ______________________________________

45. Do you live nearby?

___Yes ___No

46. What is the highest grade that you have completed in school?

___Elementary school

___9th grade

___10th grade

___11th grade

___12th grade

___1 - 2 years of college

___other (Specify number of years or type of school) ____________________

____

47. What is your age bracket?

___Less than 20

___20 - 29

___30 - 39

___40 -50

___50 or over

Name __________________________________ School, P.S. # ____

Sex _____(M/F)

Motivation for Learning Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS

1. How long have you been employed as an educational assistant?

___One year or less

___One - two years

___Two years or more (Specify number of years) ______

2. (If more than one year, ask:) What school did you work in last year?

___Same school

___Different school, P.S. # ____

3. What program did you work on last year (Name of program________________

_______________________________)

4. How much training did you have for this job before your actually began work?

___None

___Two to three days

___One week

___More than one week (Specify amount of training) ____________________

5. Was the training given in a

___Large group (More than 10 people)

___Small group (Less than 10 people) or

___Individually

___Other (Specify type) ____

6. Who was your teacher for the training?

___Guidance counselor

___Classroom teacher

___Other school personnel: Title ______________________________

___A college or university: Name ______________________________

___An anti-poverty agency: Name ______________________________

___Other (Specify) ____

7. How much training is there for you while you are working in the program?

___None

___One hour per day

___One hour per week

___Two hours per week

___More than 2 hrs. per week (Specify amount of time) ___________

8. Is the training given in a

___Large group (More than 10 people)

___Small group (Less than 10 people) or

___Individually

___Other (Specify type)

9. Who is your teacher?

___Guidance counselor

___Classroom teacher

___Other school personnel: Title ____________________

___A college or university: Name ______________________

___An anti-poverty agency: Name _______________________

___Other (Specify) ____

10. How many hours a week do you work?

___10 or less

___11 - 15

___16 - 20

___More than 20 (Specify number of hours) ______

11. How well do you like what you are doing?

___Like very much

___Like somewhat

___Dislike somewhat

___Dislike greatly

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

12. What are your duties and responsibilities? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Helping guidance counselor and teacher with students

___Assisting the guidance counselor and/or teacher with records and paper work

___Assisting the guidance counselor and/or teacher with collection of material and planning work

___Custodian of children out of class

___None of the above

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

____

13. Do you feel that you are needed for what you are doing?

___Yes, very much

___Yes, most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not much

___No

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

14. Does this work mean more to you than just a job?

___Yes

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not really

___No

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

15. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

16. To whom are you responsible?

___Guidance counselor

___Classroom teacher

___Don't know

___Other (Specify title) ______________________________

17. How would you rate the guidance counselor?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

____

18. Why? (Get specifics) ______________________________

____

19. What is your relationship to the guidance counselor?

___Work closely with her

___Receive direction and instruction from her

___Have very little contact with her

___Other (Describe relationship) ____

____

20. What is your relationship to the classroom teachers?

___Work closely with them

___Receive direction and instruction from them

___Have very little contact with them

___Other (Describe relationship) ____

____

21. Do you feel that the work you are doing is important?

___Yes, very important

___Yes, most of the time

___Sometimes

___No, not very

___No, not at all

___Other (Specify) ____

____

22. How do you think it is important? (Get specifics) ________________________

____

23. Do you feel that you are an important part of the "team" working with the children?

___Yes, very much an important part

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not really

___No
___Other (Specify) ____

24. Do you feel that you need more help in order to accomplish the requirements of your job?

___Yes

___I think so

___I don't know

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

25. (If yes, ask:) What kind of help do you think that you need?

___Assistance from the guidance counselor and teacher

___Assistance from the parents of the children

___Cooperation from the children

___More (better) equipment and materials

___Other (Specify) ____

____

26. Do you feel that you are receiving the help that you require?

___Yes, definitely

___Yes, most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not regularly

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

27. How often do you work with the guidance counselor?

___When needed

___Most of the time

___Some of the time

___Not very often

___Seldom

___Other (Specify) ____

28. Does the guidance counselor ask your opinion concerning the students and program?

___Yes, often

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Seldom

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

29. Do you ask the guidance counselor for her opinion concerning the students and program?

___Yes, often

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Seldom

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

30. How often do you work with the teachers?

___Always

___Sometimes

___Rarely

___Never

___Other (Describe) ____

____

31. Do the teachers ask your opinion concerning the students and program?

___Always

___Sometimes

___Rarely

___Never

___Other (Describe) ____

____

32. Do you ask the teachers for their opinions concerning the students and program?

___Always

___Sometimes

___Rarely

___Never

___Other (Describe) ____

33. What is your attitude toward the school in general?

____

____

____

34. Has your attitude toward the school changed since you have been employed as an educational assistant?

___Yes

___No

___Somewhat

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ____

____

35. (If yes, ask:) How has your opinion changed?

___More favorable

___Less favorable

___More understanding of the problems faced by the school

___More understanding of the lack of concern on the part of the school for the needs and interests of the children

___Other (Describe) ____

____

36. How would you rate the program overall?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ____

____

37. Why do you think that the program is (excellent, good, fair, or poor)?

___Is of real benefit to the children

___Helps the children adjust better to the school environment

___The idea of the program is good but, it needs better organization

___The program does not really help the children

___The program is disorganized

___Other (Specify) ____

38. How well do you think the children like the program?

___Very much

___O.K.

___Not very much

___No opinion, don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

39. What would you suggest to improve the program?

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals employed in the program

___More para-professionals employed in the program

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Describe modifications) ______________________________

____

____

40. Would you like to be an educational assistant in this program next year?

___Yes ___No

41. Why?

___Duties are rewarding

___Duties that are performed are not the same as those that were described when the job was accepted

___Salary is (adequate, inadequate)

___Number of hours per week (too few, too many)

___Personality conflict

___Lack of clear direction from guidance counselor and/or teachers

___Other (Describe reason) ____

____

42. How did you hear about your job?

___A community organization meeting

___A newsletter from the school

___A poster

___My child's teacher

___A friend

___Other (Specify how or from whom) _________________________________

43. Who actually hired you?

___A community agency representative

___Title I coordinator

___Guidance counselor

___Principal

___Other (Specify whom) ____

44. Do you live nearby?

___Yes ___No

45. What is the highest grade that you have completed in school?

___Elementary school

___9th grade

___10th grade

___11th grade

___12th grade

___1 - 2 years of college

___Other (Specify number of years or type of school) ______________________

46. What is your age bracket?

___Less than 20

___20 - 29

___29 - 30

___30 - 39

___39 and over

Name ____________________________ School, P.S. # _______

Sex _____(M/F)

Parental Involvement Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARENTS WHO HAVE ATTENDED WORKSHOPS 2-3 TIMES

1. How many workshops for parents have you attended at P.S. ____?

___One

___Two

___Three

___More than three (Specify number____)

___Don't know

2. How did you find out about the workshops?

___Posters

___Newsletter from school

___Verbal information from child

___Verbal information from another parent

___Visit from family assistant

___Other (Specify) ____

3. What do you think is the purpose of the workshops?

___To tell us how our children are learning

___To teach us how to help our children learn to read

___To help us become more familiar with the schools

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

4. Would you like to attend more workshops if possible?

___Yes

___No

___Perhaps

___Don't know

5. Why have you been anable to attend more workshops?

___Employed during the day

___Too busy with home and other children

___Have smaller children in the home

___Do not understand what the workshops are

___Language difficulty

___Transportation difficulty

___Other (Specify) ____________________

6. Do you know that babysitters are available to take care of your younger children at the school while you attend the workshops?

___Yes ___No

7. (If yes, ask:) Have you left your children with the babysitter when you attended the workshops?

___Yes ___No

8. (If no, ask:) Why not?

___Children too young

___Children afraid of strangers

___Have relative or friend to stay with children

___Other (Specify) ____________________

____

9. (If parents cannot attend workshop because of employment during the day,ask) Would you be interested in attending more workshops if they were held during the evening?

___Yes

___No

___Perhaps

10. Have the workshops that you attended given you any ideas about how to help your child learn to read?

___Yes

___No

___Some of them

Give example: ____

____

11. Do you receive the newspaper about the workshops, called the "Readers' Reader"?

___Yes ___No

12. (If yes, ask:) Has it given you any ideas about how to help your child to learn to read?

___Yes

___No

___Sometimes

13. Have you been visited by a family assistant from the school?

___Yes ___No

14. Have you ever met your child's teacher?

___Yes ___No

15. Do you feel free to contact your child's teacher and discuss his or her progress?

___Yes

___No

___Partially

___Other (Specify) ____

16. If your child was having a problem, would you discuss the problem with someone in the school?

___Yes (Go to # 18)

___No (Go to # 19)

___Perhaps

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

17. (If yes, ask:) With whom would you discuss the problem?

___The principal

___A teacher

___The guidance counselor

___The family assistant

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

18. (If no, ask:) Why wouldn't you discuss your child's problem with anyone in the school?

___Don't know anyone in the school

___Don't think they would help

___Language difficulty

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

19. What would you suggest to improve the program?

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals

___More para-professionals in the program

___Better books and materials

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

Name ______________________ School, P.S. # ________

Sex __________

Grade of child ______________ Sex of child ______(M/F)

B100

Parental Involvement Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARENTAL WORKSHOP TEACHERS

1. Is this the first year that you have taught parental workshops?

___ Yes ___ No

2. (If no, ask:) Do you think it has changed since it began in 1967-1968?

___ Yes ___ No

3. (If yes, ask:) How do you think it has changed? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___ Better organized

___ Better curriculum

___ More and better material

___ More parent participation

___ New teachers

___ More experienced para-professionals

___ Less organized

___ Fewer para-professionals

___ Less parent participation

___ Other (specify changes)

4. How would you rate the Parental Involvement Program overall?

___ Excellent

___ Good

___ Fair

___ Poor

___ No opinion

5. Why? (Get specifics) ____

____

6. How would you rate the parents' reaction to the workshops?

___ Very enthusiastic

___ Enthusiastic

___ Fair

___ Not interested

___ Don't know

___ Other (specify reaction)________________________________

7. Do you have a curriculum plan for your workshops?

___ Yes

___ No

___ Other (Specify)____

____

8. (If yes, ask:) How did you obtain this curriculum?

___ Was developed by the Program Director

___ Was adopted from another parental involvement program

___ Was developed jointly by workshop teachers

___ Was developed by self for program

___ Other (Specify) ____

____

9. What kinds of materials do you use in your workshops? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Books

___Objects from the parent's/children's environment

___Special commercially developed material

___Personally created materials

___All of above

___Other (Specify) ____

10. Have you ever taught a parental workshop other than this one?

___Yes ___No

11. (If yes, ask:) Where?

___(Name of school or organization)______________________________

____

___(Name of program)____

____

12. How long did you teach this program?

___ Less than one year

___ One-two years

___More than two years (Specify number of years______)

13. Did you have any orientation or planning sessions prior to beginning to teach these workshops?

___Yes ___No

14. (If yes, ask:) How much?

___ One-two days

___ Three-four days

___ Five days

___ More than 5 days (Specify number of days__________)

15. (If yes to question 3 ask:) With whom did you have these orientation or planning sessions?

___Program Director

___Other workshop teachers

___Classroom teachers

___College of University personnel

___All of the above

___Other (Specify)____

16. Have you attended any planning sessions since you have begun teaching the workshops?

___Yes ___No

17. (If yes, ask:) How many?

___One

___Two

___Three

___More than 3 (Specify number_____)

18. With whom did you have these planning sessions?

___Program Director

___Other workshop teachers

___Classroom teachers

___College or university personnel

___All of the above

___Other (Specify)____

19. Do you have a para-professional(s) assigned to your workshop?

___Yes ___ No

20. (If yes, ask:) What are his (her) duties and responsibilities? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Works directly with the parents

___Assists the teacher with records and paper work

___Assists the teacher with collection of material and planning of sessions

___None of the above

___Other (Describe responsibilities) ______________________________

____

21. To whom is the para-professional responsible?

___Workshop teacher

___Classroom teacher

___Program Director

___Don't know

___Other (Specify person)____

22. What is your relationship to the program director?

___Work closely with him (her)

___Receive material and suggestions from him (her)

___Have little contact with him (her)

___Other (Describe relationship)______________________________

____

23. What would you suggest to improve the workshops? (Check more than one, if indicated)

___Expand the program

___Hire more experienced teachers

___Develop better curriculum

___Have more planning sessions

___Obtain more and better material

___Have better organization

___Hire more para-professionals

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modification)______________________________

____

Name______________________ Sex_____(M/F) Age__________

School______________________

New York City teaching licenses held:

A. Regular licenses in the following usbjects:______________________

____

B. Substitute licenses in the following subjects:______________________

____

C. Ancillary licenses:______________________________

D. The subject I am presently teaching is (are):______________________

E. Grade level(s)______________________________

F. Total number of years of teaching experience:______________________

B105

Parental Involvement Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR FAMILY ASSISTANTS

1. How long have you been employed as a family assistant?

___One year or less

___1 - 2 years

___2 years or more (Specify number of years) ______

2. (If more than one year , ask:) Did you work on the Parental Involvement program last year?

___Yes ___No

3. (If no, ask:) What school did you work in last year?

___Same school

___Different school, P.S. # ___

4. What program did you work on last year? (Name of program) ________________

____

5. How much training did you have for this job before you actually began work?

___None

___One - two days

___Three - four days

___One week

___More than one week (Specify amount of training) ____________________

6. Was the training given in a

___Large group (More than 10 people)

___Small group (Less than 10 people)

___Individually

___Other (Specify type) ____

7. Who was your teacher for the training?

___Parents' workshop teacher

___Classroom teacher

___Other school personnel: Title ________________________________

___A college or university: Name ________________________________

___An anti-poverty agency: Name ________________________________

___Other (Specify) ________________________________

8. How much training is there for you while you are working in this program?

___None

___One hour per day

___One hour per week

___Two hours per week

___More than 2 hrs. per week (Specify amount of time) ________________

9. Is the training given in a

___Large group (More than 10 people)

___Small group (Less than 10 people) or

___Individually

___Other (Specify type) ________________________________

10. Who is your teacher?

___Parents' workshop teacher

___A classroom teacher

___Other school personnel: Title ________________________

___A college or university: Name ________________________________

___An anti-poverty agency: Name ________________________________

___Other (Specify) ________________________________

11. How many hours a week do you work?

___10 or less

___11 - 15

___16 - 20

___More than 20 (Specify # of hours) __________

12. How well do you like what you are doing?

___Like very much

___Like somewhat

___Dislike somewhat

___Dislike greatly

___Other (Specify)

13. What are your duties and responsibilities? (Check more than one if indicated)

___Work directly with the children

___Visit parents in their homes

___Work with parents in the school

___Assist the teacher with records and paper work

___Assist the teacher with collection of material and planning lessons

___None of the above

___Other (Specify) ____

14. (If the answer is, visit parents in their homes, ask:) How many parents have you visited?

___Less than 5

___6 - 10

___11 - 20

___21 - 30

___More than 30 (Number, approx. _______)

15. What has been the general response of the parents that you have visited?

___Hostile

___Apathetic

___Friendly

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ____

____

16. (If answer to 13 is, work with parents in the school, ask:) What has been the response of the parents with whom you work?

___Hostile

___Apathetic

___Friendly

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ____

____

17. Do you feel that you are needed for what you are doing?

___Yes

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Seldom

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

18. Does this work mean more to you than just a job?

___Yes

___Most of the time

___Sometimes

___Not really

___No

___Other (Specify) ____

19. Why? (Get specifics) ____________________

____

20. To whom are you responsible?

___Parents' workshop coordinator

___Parents' workshop teacher

___Program director

___Don't know

___Other (Specify title) ____________________

21. What is your relationship to the program coordinator?

___Work closely with him (her)

___Receive direction and instruction from him (her)

___Have very little contact with him (her)

___Other (Specify) ____________________

____

22. How would you rate the program coordinator?

___Very effective

___Effective

___Barely effective

___Ineffective

___Very ineffective

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____________________

23. Why? (Get specifics) ____________________

24. What is your relationship to the parents' workshop teacher?

___Work closely with him (her)

___Receive direction and instruction from him (her)

___Have very little contact with hmm (her)

___Other (Describe relationship) ______________________________

____

25. What is your attitude toward the school in general?

____

____

____

26. Has your attitude toward the school changed since you have been employed as a family assistant?

___Yes

___No

___Somewhat

___Don't know

___Other (Describe) ______________________________________

____

27. (If yes, ask:) How has your opinion changed?

___More favorable

___Less favorable

___More understanding of the problems faced by the school

___More understanding of the lack of concern on the part of the school for the needs and interests of the children

___More understanding of the lack of relevance of the present educational matter for the children

___Other (Describe) ______________________________________

____

28. How would you rate the program overall?

___Excellent

___Good

___Fair

___Poor

___No opinion, don't know

___0 Other (describe)______________________________

____

29. Why do you think that the program is (

___Has real meaning for the parents

___Stimulates the interest of the parents in the progress of their children

___The idea of the program is good, but it needs better organization

___The program needs more personnel

___Program does not capture the interest of the parents

___The program is disorganized

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

30. How well do you think the parents like the program?

___Very much

___O.K.

___Not very much

___No opinion, don't know

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

31. What would you suggest to improve the program?

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals employed in the program

___More para-professionals employed in the program

___Better books and materials

___No suggestion, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modification) ______________________________

____

32. Would you like to be a family assistant on this program next year?

___Yes ___No

33. Why?

___Duties are rewarding

___Duties that are performed are not the same as those that were described when the job was accepted

___Salary (___adequate, ___Inadequate)

___Number of hours per week (___too few, ___too many)

___Personality conflict

___Lack of clear direction from teacher (s)

___Other (Describe reason) ______________________________

____

34. How did you hear about your job?

___A community organization meeting

___A newsletter from the school

___A poster

___My child's teacher

___A friend

___Other (Specify how or from whom) ______________________

35. Who actually hired you?

___A community agency representative

___Title I coordinator

___Program director

___Principal

___Other (Specify whom) ____________________________

36. Do you live nearby?

___Yes ___No

37. What is the highest grade that you have completed in school?

___Elementary school

___9th grade

___10th grade

___11th grade

___12th grade

___1 - 2 years of college

___Other (Specify number of years or type of school) ______________________

38. What is your age bracket?

___Less than 20

___20 - 29

___30 - 39

___40 - 49

___50 or over

Name ______________________________________ School, P.S. # _________

Sex ____(M/F)

B114

Parental Involvement Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARENTS WHO ATTEND WORKSHOPS REGULARLY

1. How many workshops for parents have you attended at P.S. _____?

   ___ 5 - 10

   ___11 - 15

   ___16 - 20

   ___More than 20(Number if known_______)

   ___Don't know

2. How did you find out about the workshops?

   ___Posters

   ___Newsletter from school

   ___Verbal information from child

   ___Verbal information from another parent

   ___Visit from family assistant

   ___Other (Specify) ________________________________

3. What do you think the purpose of the workshops is?

   ___To tell us how your children are learning

   ___To teach us how to help your children learn

   ___To help us become more familiar with the school

   ___Other (Specify) ________________________________

4. Do you know that babysitters are available to take care of your younger children while you attend the workshops?

   ___Yes ___No

5. (If yes, ask:) Have you left your children with the babysitter when you attended the workshops?

___Yes ___No

6. (If no, ask:) Why not?

___Children too young

___Children afraid of strangers

___Have a relative or friend to stay with children

___Other (Specify) ____

____

7. Have the workshops that you attended given you any ideas about how to help your child learn to read?

___Yes

___No

___Some of them

___Other (Specify)

Give examples: ____

____

8. Have you tried to use any of these ideas with your child?

___Yes

___No

___Sometimes

9. (If yes, ask:) Do you think that they have helped your child to read better?

___Yes

___A little

___No

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) - ____

10. Do you receive the newspaper about the workshops, called the "Readers' Reader"?

___Yes ___No

11. (If yes, ask:) Has it given you any ideas about how to help yoour child learn to read?

___Yes ___No ___Sometimes

12. Have you been visited by a family assistant from the school?

___Yes

___No

13. Have you ever met your child's teacher?

___Yes ___No

14. Do you feel free to contact your child's teacher and discuss his or her progress?

___Yes

___No

___Partially

15. If your child was having a problem would you discuss the problem with someone in the school?

___Yes (Go to # 16)

___No (Go to # 17)

___Perhaps

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

16. With whom would you discuss the problem?

___The principal

___A teacher

___The guidance counselor

___The family assistant

___Other (Specify) ____

17. Why wouldn't you discuss your child's problem with anyone in the school?

___Don't know anyone in the school

___Don't think they would help

___Language difficulty

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

18. What would you suggest to improve the program?

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals

___More para-professionals in the program

___Better books and materials

___No suggestion

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

____

Name ______________________ School, P.S. #__________

Sex______________(M/F)

Grade of child______________ Sex of child______(M/F)

Parental Involvement Program

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARENTS WHO HAVE NOT ATTENDED WORKSHOPS

1. Do you know that there are workshops for parents at P.S. # _____?

___Yes ___No

2. (If yes, ask:) How did you find out about the workshops?

___A poster

___Newsletter from school

___Verbal information from child

___Verbal information from another parent

___Visit from family assistant

___Other (Specify) ____

3. What do you think is the purpose of the workshops?

___To tell us how our children are learning

___To teach us how to help our children learn

___To help us become more familiar with the school

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ____

4. Would you like to attend the workshops if possible?

___Yes

___No

___Perhaps

___Don't know

5. Why have you been unable to attend?

   ___Employed during the day

   ___Too busy with home and other children

   ___Have smaller children in the homs

   ___Do not understand what the workshops are

   ___Language difficulty

   ___Transportation difficulty

   ___Other (Specify) ____

   ____

6. Do you know that baby-sitters are available to take care of your younger children while you attend the workshops?

   ___Yes ___No

7. (If parent cannot attend because of employment during the day, ask:) Would you be interested in attending the workshops if they were held during the evening?

   ___Yes

   ___No

   ___Perhaps

   ___Don't know

8. Do you receive the newspaper about the workshops called the "Readers' Reader"?

   ___Yes

   ___No

   ___Sometimes

   ___Other (Specify) ____

9. (If yes, ask:) Has it given you any ideas about how to help your child learn to read?

   ___Yes

   ___No

   ___Sometimes

   ___Other (Specify) ____

10. Have you been visited by a family assistant from the school?

___Yes ___No

11. Have you met your child's teacher?

___Yes ___No

12. Do you feel free to contact your child's teacher and discuss his or her progress?

___Yes

___No

___Partially

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

13. If your child was having a problem would you discuss the problem with someone in the school?

___Yes (Continue with question 15)

___No (Go to question 16)

___Perhaps

___Don't know

14. With whom would you discuss the problem?

___Principal

___Teacher

___Guidance Counselor

___Family Assistant

___Don't know

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

15. Why wouldn't you discuss your child's problem with anybody in the school?

___Don't know anyone in the school

___Don't think they would help

___Language difficulty

___Other (Specify) ______________________________

16. What would you suggest to improve the program?

___Better organization

___More training for teachers and para-professionals

___More para-professionals in the program

___Better books and materials

___No suggestions, O.K. as is

___Other (Specify modifications) ____

____

Name ______________________________ School, P.S. # ____________

Sex _____(M/F)

Grade of child ______________________ Sex of child ________(M/F)

APPENDIX C

MATERIALS USED IN CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

The African Ancestors

I. Earliest Man
  -Africa is rich in collection of bones of earliest beings
    Olduvai Gorge - Tanganyika - Dr. Leakey
  -Discovery of Agriculture - 8000 B.C.
  -Use of hand tools
  -Use of metals (mining, smelting, working of copper and iron)

II. Egypt - Kush (province of Egypt) first black people
  -Piankhy - conquest of Egypt
  -Taharqa - son of Piankhy - lived at Tamis
  -Meroe - ancient city - ruins - pottery - hieroglyphics
  -Axum - Kingdom

III. Ethiopia - Ancient kingdom - 1000 B.C.
  Hamitic Cushitic - Nilotic peoples
  -Amhatic - written language
  -Gelez and Tigrinya - other languages
  -The Ethiopian Orthodox Coptic Church
  -Other peoples
  -The "Kebra Negast" - Glory of Kings - early history
  -Haile Selassie - The Lion of Judah

IV. Ghana - the land of gold
  Gold was mined by Wangara
  Trade in copper, cloth, salt, dried fruit, cowries
  The Soninke rulers
  The writings of El Bekri
  -The Almoravids
  -The Sosso rulers

V. Mali - The Mandingo
  -Mansa Musa - most famous king
  -Timbukut - Senne

VI. Songhai
  Ancient capital at Gao
  Sonni Ali
  Askia Mohammed

VII. Contributions of African Peoples
  1. Man first used cutting tools made from stone
  2. Man smelted iron
  3. Man built homes and pyramids
  4. Man instituted the family
  5. Man organized governments

VII. (cont.)

6. Man engaged in sports
7. Man discovered medical knowledge
8. Man raised cattle
9. Man first used seeds
10. Man wore cotton fabrics
11. Man made glazed earthen ware
12. Man invented drums and other musical instruments
13. Man invented basketry
14. Man developed wood carving
15. Man used masks and artifacts for ceremonies and recreation
16. Man engaged in friendly commerce
17. Man practised a form of democracy and neighborly love
18. Man thought about a Universal God

THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

The African American Experience

I. Early Arrivals
  Explorers
    Estevonica
  Settlers
    Du Sable
  Indentured Servants

II. Slavery
  Reasons - need for free cheap laborers
  Justifications
    1. blacks used to working in the heat
    2. rescue from "savagery" of Africa
    3. Christianize
    4. slaves were happy

III. Slave and Free
  A. Craftsmen
      bricklayers
      iron workers
      carpenters, etc.
  B. Artists and scientists and inventors
  C. Wealthy businessmen - i.e. James Forten

IV. Revolutionary War Period
  A. Black fighters for American independence on land and sea
      i.e. Peter Salem
           Salem Poor
  B. They chose Britain and freedom
  C. Results
      1. Colonization societies
      2. 3/5 of a man
      3. Importation of slavery abolished by 1808

V. African American Organizations
  A. Societies - i.e. New York African Society 1808
     Churches i.e. Abysinnian Church - Mother Zion
     Conferences - i.e. New York State Conference of Free Africans
  B. Purposes
  C. Activities - schools, station of underground railroad, etc.

VI. Resistance to Slavery
  A. Slave Revolts
      Prosser
      Turner
      Vesey
  B. John Brown

VI. (cont.)
- C. Abolitionists
  - 1. Black Abolitionists
    i.e. F. Douglas - Sojourner Truth
  - 2. White Abolitionists
    i.e. Garrison - Lovejoy

- D. Results
  - 1. Fear
  - 2. Reprisals
  - 3. Events leading to Civil Way

VII. The Civil War
- A. Causes
- B. Events
  - 1. Black troops volunteer - rejected
  - 2. Use of black behind lines - cooks, wranglers, nurses (H. Tubman)
  - 3. "Contraband"
  - 4. Black troops used
  - 5. New York City Draft Riots
  - 6. Emancipation Proclamation
    - a. political reason - to attract French and British aid
    - b. free behind the lines - southern aid (slave laborers)
    - c. did not free all slaves in U.S.

VIII. Reconstruction Years - 1865-1877
- A. Freedmen - what to do with freed slaves
  - 1. Return to Africa - idea liked by Lincoln
  - 2. Send to Arizona and New Mexico
  - 3. 40 Acres and a mule
- B. Civil Rights Laws
- C. Freedmen's Bureau
  hospitals
  schools
  colleges
- D. Black Legislators
  Federal
  State
  City
- E. Other Office Holders

IX. Post Reconstruction Years 1877-1914
- A. Economic
  - 1. Sharecropper Economy
  - 2. Prisoner Labor
  - 3. Menial Jobs - cut out of organized labor market
- B. African American Poetry
- C. African American Music

X. The Black Service man
  - World War I
    - i.e. Colonel Young Affair
    - World War II
    - Korean
    - Vietnam

XI. African American Art

XII. The African American in New York City from the 1600's to the present

XIII. Equality Now
  - A. The Why
  - B. Where
  - C. By Whom - Muslim
    - Malcolm X
    - Martin Luther King, Jr.
    - Stokley Carmichael, etc.
  - D. What
  - E. Compare with slave protest and abolitionists

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

The Latin American World

Middle America

- A small region divided into many parts
- A melting pot of peoples
    - Descendants of Early inhabitants - Indian
    - Descendants of European settlers - Spanish, French, Dutch, English, Danish
    - Descendants of Black peoples from Africa
- A source of valuable products for trade - sugar cane, bananas, coffee, pineapple, valuable woods, minerals
- Serious problems, low income, improper food, housing, medical care
    - Single farm crops
    - Foreign ownership of land
- Self-help Projects
    - e.g. Operation Bootstrap in Puerto Rico
- Clarification of geographical concepts

The West Indies

- The Greater Antilles
    - Cuba Hispaniola (Haiti and Dominican Republic) Jamaica, Puerto Rico
- The Lesser Antilles
    - Basse Terre, Dominica, Martinique, Grenada, Saba Anguilla, St. Martin, Barbuda, Antigua, Grande Terre
        - Trinidad, Barbados, Aruba, Curacoa
        - The Virgin Islands - The United States
            - St. Croix, St. Thomas, St. John
        - The Virgin Islands - British
            - Tortola, Virgin Gorda, Anguilla
- Early Peoples of West Indies
    - Arawak (Taino) Quisqueya, Caribs

Case Study - The Tainos - on the island of Boriquen (Puerto Rico)
(Borinquen in Hispanicized form)

1. (Similarity with present day Indians - the rain forest people)
2. This was the people Columbus found inhabiting the island on his second voyage in November 1493
3. Peace-loving domestic people - well developed social sense
4. Cacique or chief ruled each village or settlement
5. At the time Ponce de Leon took possession of the island, Aqueybana was chief of the Tainos - lived at Guanica, the largest Indian village on the Guayanilla River
6. Three social castes - the Mationjeri, the Bopari, the Guaopari
7. Social Organization
    a. Caciques - chiefs
    b. Nitaynos - subchiefs
        one lead in hunting
        one lead in fishing, etc.

7. (cont.)
    c. Bohiques - medicine men - a large and powerful group
    d. Nabori - common laborers, tilling soil, making implements, hunting, fishing, fighting
    All tasks were equally respected
8. Property was a communal affair
9. Each settlement laid out around a central plaza or batey
The chief's house - the bohio - rectangular
The other houses - caneyes - round - constructed from palm leaves, mud and poles - (similar to present day bohios or thatched huts)
Use of the Playing Fields or Juegos de Bola
Zemi - protected the home
Maboya - spirit of night, destroyer of crops
The Bohique - medicine healer
  teacher - supervised ceremonies

Physical Appearance (Columbus' writings)
  Bronze skin (Columbus called then the color of canaries)
  Slightly smaller in stature than Spaniards
  Cleanliness was noted by Spaniards - constant bathing
  Painted skin partly for adornment but even more as an effective protection

Their Homes
  Chose healthful sites remote from swamps
  Showed greater wisdom than Spanish whose early settlements were located in worst possible spots, where many died because of yellow fever and malaria

Varied diet - wild fowl, fish, vegetables, cereals and fruits
  Sweet potato - Cassava bread - from mamioc or yucca, corn
  Fishing using the remora (small fish)
  Methods of planting - (corn, manior, yucca), cotton, sweet potato, tobacco
  Use of cotton for nets, hammocks
  Animals - hunting weapons
  Artifacts - stone, wood, shell
  The bohique or medicine man
  Animals - hunting weapons

The Arrival of the Caribs
  Wars with Caribs - the subjugation of women - Women retained the Taino speech - Men used Carib.

The New Aggressor from Spain

- Columbus' voyages - San Juan Bautista
- Ponce de Leon - governor and colonizer
- Aqueybana - local cacique - settlement at Caparra - 1508-09
- Soto mayor - second settlement - 1510 - port of Aguada
- Use of Indians to work gold mines (repartimientos)
- Indian revolts under Guaybana and Guarionex
  - Attacks by French-English - Caribs
- Introduction of black slaves from Africa
- Father de las Casas
- Introduction of sugar cane - coffee - coconuts
- The Colonial Period - Puerto Rico sent rum, sugar, tobacco to Spai
  - Attacks by the Dutch, French, the English
  - Spanish Province with representation in Cortes
    - Ramon Power y Giraet - 1775-1813
- Uprising
  - 1864 - Padial
  - 1867 - Dr. Ramon Emerteno Betances
  - 1868 - Lares Rebellion
  - 1897 - Puerto Rico autonomy
    - Parties - Union Puertorriquena - Cintron
      - Partido de la Independcia - Dr. Gandia and Del Valle
      - Munoz Rivera - Jose de Diego
  - 1898-1940 Under the American Flag
    - Occupation
    - The Foraher Act 1900
  - Commonwealth Status
    - Munoz Marin - 1st elected governor
    - Villella
    - Ferre
  - Puerto Rican Culture
    - Santos and Santeros
    - The Decima Jibaro - countryside poetry related to Andalusian couplets and seguidilla
    - writers
  - 17th Century - Bernardo de Bal buena - Bernardo
  - 1630 - Padre Francisco Santamaria - first Puerto Rican poet
    - Juan Garcia Troche and Antonio de Santa
    - Clara - "Memorial and General Description of the Island of Puerto Rico" - 1582
    - Padre Diego de Torres Vargas
  - 17th century - "Description of Island and City of Puerto Rico"

Leaders

- Eugenio Maria de Hostas - "The Pilgrimage of Bayoan - expose of restrictions of Spanish colonial regime
- Ramos Baldorioty de Castro - Puerto Rican deputy to Cortes in Spain - editory of "El Derecho" and "La Cronica"

Leaders (cont.)

Dr. Ramon Emeterio Betances - one of the first champions of Puerto Rico independence

"La Vierge de Borinquen"
"Les Voyager de Scaldado"
"La Botijuela"
Don Manuel Alonso - "El Jibaro"

Music - Influences

Liturgical chants of Catholic Church
Airs from S. Spain and northern countries of South America
The Jibaro orchestra - musica brava - troubador groups travelled from town to town like minstrels in Europe
Instruments used were tiple cuatro, bordonus (native guitars) high, medium, low pitch
The quiro or quicharo - hollow bottle shaped dried gourd played with a wire fork (adopted from Indians)
Maraccas - round gourds filled with seeds or pebbles
Early compositions
  coplas or couplets
  decima - song of ten verses
  seis chorreado - 2/4 song and dance tune
  aquinaldos Christmas Carols
  jibaro waltz
Areitos - Indian dance tunes
Plena - African influences
The Danza
  Manuel Tavarez 1843 - 1883 developed the danza
Composers - Juan Morell Campos 1856 - 1896
  La Borinquena - words by Lola Rodriguez de Tio 1868
                  music by Feliz Astol
  Rafael Hernandez
    Lamento Boncano El Buen Borincano
Performers - Figueroa Bors. Countess Albani
Painting
  Indians knew how to extract color from plants and clays
  Jose Campeche 1753-1809 Self taught - painted on wood panels and copper religious subjects
  La Caida del Angel (The Fall of the Angel)
  La Concepcion ola Reina de los Angeles
  La Virgen de Belen (Virgin of Bethlehem)
    in San Jose Church in San Juan
  Franasco Oller 1833-1917
    Studied in Europe - realist
    "El Velorio" The Wake (University of Puerto Rico)
  Many important contemporaries
    J. Rosado, Homar, Tufino, Irizarry, Bonilla
Folk Songs
Folklore
Cooking

Special Events - CHIP

Nigeria - drummer and dance
Ghana - musician
Puerto Rico - painter
Puerto Rico - folklorist
Haiti - musician
Trip to Union Settlement House
Trip to cultural heritage center in Bronx
Trip to Columbia University to hear Voice, Inc.
Trip to District Office to see culminating CHIP exhibit

APPENDIX D

COMMUNITY INTERVIEWS

Summaries of the interviews with community representatives in each of the districts where the projects were conducted are presented in this section. The representatives were officials of the anti-poverty agencies in each community. Community representatives serve in various volunteer positions. They receive no salary and no assistance. They are asked to fulfill many functions but have no help. Sometimes they are called upon to keep programs from floundering, and are called upon to do many things that should be done by the staff. These summaries reveal differences among the community representatives in terms of their participation and satisfaction with the projects.

District 16 - Brooklyn
Reading and Language Arts
Youth-in-Action

The representative, as a member of the education committee, was involved with the planning of Title I programs for 1968-69 and thus is aware of the reading program in District 16. She has not "monitored" this or any other Title I program, however, because she has no staff to do so.

She has had no information on the progress of this program, although she has an "excellent" relationship with the district superintendent and his staff; any information that she gets about the program is feedback from interested parents and/or classroom teachers.

District 16 - Brooklyn
Reading and Language Arts
Bushwick Community Corporation

The representative is very much aware of this program. She has received information from the district superintendent's office that the program is progressing well. However, she wants to find out more about the program and intends to get concrete data on its effectiveness. She plans to ask for data on the reading ability of the children when they began and ended the program. She feels that this kind of evaluation is essential before deciding whether to recommend that the program be re-funded.

She has a good relationship with two members of the district superintendent's staff and has always received cooperation when she has asked for information. She feels free to stop by the district office and pick up information on the programs, but nobody from the district office ever calls her and says "such and such is happening in a program and we would like you to know about it."

District 4 - Manhattan
Cultural Heritage Implementation Program
Upper Westside Community Corporation

The representative is not familiar with the CHIP program except for what the proposal says. The U.W.C.C. gets no feedback from the schools. The Community Corporation gets information only if they go into the schools and do an evaluation or if they speak with the parents.

There is much resistance on the part of the principals to the Community Corporation or anything that has to do with community control. The attitude of the principals is "this is my school; don't tell me what to do."

District 6 - Manhattan
Motivation for Learning
Central Harlem Community Corporation

The parents of P.S. 175 have been very much involved in the program, have not complained about it, and trust the principal. The representative is aware of no particular problems in the program, but she does not have a staff to do any checking and must investigate all complaints herself; there have not yet been any complaints with the program. There is no routine contact between program directors and community representatives.

The community representative would like to see the Motivation for Learning program extended to other schools, but funds are limited and must be distributed as equitably as possible. She feels that more research is needed to determine where and in what programs most money is needed. The Motivation for Learning Program, however, she thinks, should not only be re-funded but should be strengthened.

District 7 - Bronx
Parental Involvement
Hunts Point Community Corporation

The representative is dissatisfied and disgusted with the program. She feels that it has nothing new or interesting about it to attract and activate the parents. She believes that this is true because it is too much controlled by the "status quo; that is, the Board of Education."

According to her view the money for the program is being misspent. She says that District 7 is the worst district as far as reading levels are concerned, and a lot of money is being poured into district programs, but there are no visible results.

She believes that the community people have a lot of good ideas for programs, and, if they were permitted to implement them, they would be of some benefit to the children. But the "Board of Education people take the programs and change them all around so that they are the same old programs which are controlled by the teachers, etc., and so we have no results."

She is not given information on the progress of this program (or any other). The only way that she would get information, she says, is if the program were taken out of the hands of the Board of Education.

Last year she had parents visiting the schools and evaluating the program, but she feels that the programs are the same "tired-out old programs" so it is useless to try to evaluate them. Also, nobody paid any attention to the evaluations.

District 12 - Bronx
Closed Circuit Television
East Tremont Community Corporation

The representative stated that the "community" did not want the closed circuit television and video tape program. He said that they preferred another program that would reach a wider part of the student population and one that would also be "closer" to the students. Although they realized that the TV program is a good program, they thought that other programs would be more beneficial to the children. The district superintendent, however, wanted and insisted upon the TV program.

The representative does not really know how the program is progressing because he did not follow-up on the program after it was approved. He is not informed about the program -- not because the schools won't keep him informed, but because he is too busy. He hears that the program is doing well, but he still thinks that the money could be spent in a better way that would be of more benefit to the children.

APPENDIX E

STAFF LIST

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., Evaluation Director
Professor
School of Education
New York University

Louise Baggott, Assistant Evaluation Director

Iris Jason, Research Associate

Gloria Mixon, Consultant
Assistant Professor
School of Continuing Education
New York University

James Brooks, Interviewer

Rosalind Ellis, Interviewer

Shirley Hunter, Interviewer

Thelma Catalano, Observer

Adele Epstein, Statistical Clerk

Patricia Kressel, Statistical Clerk

Joel Harte, Secretary

Barbara Taub, Secretary